Oct 15
2000
d. 3
N 1326

*Donated*
*To The Library by*

CONGREGATION OF THE
BLESSED SACRAMENT

Highland Heights
Cleveland, Ohio

Summer, 1994

© DEMCO, INC.—Archive Safe

WITHDRAWN

LIBRARY
FATHERS OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT
[redacted]

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

# THE WORK OF ST. OPTATUS

## AGAINST THE DONATISTS

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

280.5
D

# THE WORK OF ST. OPTATUS

## BISHOP OF MILEVIS

## AGAINST THE DONATISTS

*WITH APPENDIX*

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH
WITH NOTES CRITICAL, EXPLANATORY,
THEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL

BY THE
REV. O. R. VASSALL-PHILLIPS, B.A.
BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD
PRIEST OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE MOST HOLY REDEEMER

'Legant qui volunt quae narret et quibus documentis quam multa persuadeat Venerabilis Memoriae Milevitanus Episcopus Catholicae Communionis Optatus.'—S. AUGUSTINUS.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1917

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

All rights reserved

LIBRARY
FATHERS OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT
[redacted]

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM CONG. SS. RED.

NIHIL OBSTAT

TH. BERGH, O.S.B.,

*Censor Deputatus.*

IMPRIMATUR

E. CAN. SURMONT,

*Vic. Gen.*

WESTMONASTERII

*die 15 Feb., 1915.*

# PREFACE

St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis in Africa, is perhaps the least known of all the Fathers of the Church. His treatise against the Donatists—the one work that he left to posterity, was translated into French in 1564.[1] It is extremely improbable that, but for this exception, it has, until now, ever appeared in any language save Latin. It is quite certain that it has never yet been clothed in an English dress. There is indeed an advertisement still to be seen in *The Oxford Library of the Fathers*, in which it was announced (in 1848) that a translation of St. Optatus into English would 'soon' appear. Sixty-eight years have elapsed; but this intention has not yet been carried into execution.

Until recently St. Optatus could hardly be found, even in the original Latin, anywhere but in the edition published by Du Pin at Antwerp in 1702, and subsequently incorporated by Migne. His work was until 1870 out of the reach of all persons who had not access to the largest libraries. In 1870—it is true—Fr. Hurter, S.J., published Du Pin's text in convenient form with short notes,[2] and in 1893 a new critical

[1] Cf. Migne, *P.L.* xi, p. 883. I have not been able to consult this French version.

[2] *Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula selecta*. Oeniponti.

edition was brought out (edited by the late Professor Ziwsa) in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, which has now for many years been in course of publication at Vienna. Comparatively few people, however, have heard of this excellent edition of the Latin Fathers; still fewer are aware that its volumes may be purchased separately, and that for the sum of a few shillings they may possess themselves of 'the Seven Books of St. Optatus concerning the Schism of the Donatists, against Parmenian.'

Indeed it is not too much to say that the very name of Optatus is barely known even to many students of theology and ecclesiastical history. Yet his is no mean name, and he cannot be ignored with safety, for he has bequeathed to the Church material of no small value, both to the theologian and the ecclesiastical historian. Optatus was held in high repute by the great Augustine, upon whom his influence was undoubtedly considerable. To this Harnack bears witness: 'Even when he entered into the Donatist controversy, Augustine did so as a man of the second or indeed the third generation. He therefore enjoyed the great advantage of having at his disposal a fund of conceptions and ideas already collected. In this sphere Optatus especially had worked before him.'[1]

The work of St. Optatus is, therefore, of consequence not only from the point of view of history—he is *the* historian of Donatism in its origins—but also from that of doctrine—of 'conceptions and ideas.' It derives special importance from the fact that here we find the

[1] *History of Dogma*, v. 38.

first sustained argument from the Catholic side not merely against heresy (false doctrine) but also against schism (separation from the Church).

Heresies come and go. They are essentially ephemeral, according to some transitory fashion of mental speculation. And in fact history proves that the limit of their duration is hardly known to last four centuries. Often indeed they pass into all but complete oblivion. Thus it comes about that a long and sometimes weary discussion concerning a heresy which has perhaps long since vanished from the midst of men is apt to lose much of its actuality.[1] But the Church dies not, and in every age excuses are found by the rebellious for their rebellion against her supreme authority. The argument against heresy is necessarily specialised and multiform; the argument against schism is very simple and admits of no substantial variation in its presentment.

Consequently, it never ceases to be of deep interest to follow the reasoning that has been employed by the champions of the Catholic Church, at any period of her history, on behalf of her exclusive and peremptory claim upon the spiritual allegiance of mankind. Whenever this is in discussion, there is no drowsy stirring of dead bones, but an issue which is ever-living and therefore in a certain sense ever-new. Now, upon this subject Optatus is perfectly explicit. Again and again he lays it down that there is but one true Church of Christ,[2] that she is not merely local, but is scattered

[1] Cf. Optatus, i, 9.

[2] *id.* i, 7; i, 10; ii, 1; iv, 6 etc.

all over the world,[1] her chief rulers bound together by formal bonds and proofs of union, each with his fellow,[2] and above all with the Bishop of Rome, Peter's successor.[3]

In other words for Optatus the one question of paramount importance is: 'Which and where is the One Church?'[4] And to this question his answer is clear-cut and unmistakable in its import. The Church of Christ may be easily recognised by all those who will look for her marks. She and she alone is One; she and she alone is truly Catholic. In fact this is her name—*Catholica*.[5] She alone is Apostolic—Apostolic for this reason, that all over the world ('ubique') her children are in communion with the *Cathedra Petri*,[6] the See of that Apostle to whom alone the Lord promised the keys of the kingdom of Heaven[7]—the See 'against which to contend is sacrilege.'[8]

And because Parmenian, his Donatist adversary, had failed to recognise 'where is the Church?' he is said by Optatus to have 'made confusion of everything.'[9]

The clearness and decisiveness of the teaching of St. Optatus on the Church have caused Harnack to write thus: 'In this thought (of the Church as an institution) Catholicism was first complete . . . But Augustine was not the first to declare it; he rather

[1] Optatus, i, 26; ii, 1; iii, 2 etc. etc.
[2] *id.* i, 4; ii, 3; vii, 6. [3] *id.* ii, 2; ii, 3; vii, 5.
[4] Cf. *quae, vel ubi, sit Una Ecclesia* (i, 7).
[5] *id.* i, 5; ii, 1 etc. [6] *id.* ii, 9 (cf. ii, 6 etc.).
[7] *id.* i, 10; i, 12; ii, 4; vii, 3 etc. [8] *id.* ii, 5.
[9] *sic omnia miscui ti* (i, 10).

received it from tradition. The first representative of the new conception known to us, and Augustine also knew him, was Optatus.'[1]

It is hardly necessary to observe that this 'conception' was never really 'new' in Christendom. Optatus did not invent it. He had 'received it' (in the same way that before him in Africa Cyprian had already 'received it,' and, as Harnack admits, Augustine 'received it) from tradition.' He 'received it' also from the express words of Christ and from the prophecies of the Old Testament.[2] It is, however, perfectly true to say that St. Optatus is the first writer known to us who sets out in detail the Catholic conception of the one true Church of Christ. The opportunity came to him only with the Donatist schism. It will always be the great merit of Optatus to have seized that opportunity and to have availed himself of it to such an extent, that Augustine had but to broaden it out and illustrate it with his matchless genius. St. Augustine had only to fill in the picture which St. Optatus had already drawn in clear outline. To the end of time the Catholic theologian, preacher or controversialist, desirous of showing the true nature of the Church, and the obligation (binding everywhere, always, upon all persons, and under all conceivable circumstances) of living within her visible unity, will find everything that he needs ready to his hand, in the writings of St. Optatus. Moreover, Optatus will remind us that from this obligation—

[1] *History of Dogma*, vol. v. p. 42.
[2] Optatus, ii, 1; ii, 5; iv, 6 etc. etc.

strict though it be in itself—ignorance (that ignorance which we now call 'invincible') will excuse its victims.[1] Ignorance could not be pleaded by Parmenian; it was therefore impossible to hold him guiltless. But Optatus was evidently aware that in his day in Africa (as in our day in England) there were Christians who, through no fault of their own, knew nothing of the claims of the Chair of Peter.

Apart from the constitution and marks of the Church, there is only one specific doctrine—that Baptism may not lawfully be repeated after it has once been validly administered (the *Credo unum Baptisma* of the Creed)—with which St. Optatus was *directly* concerned in his controversy with his Donatist adversaries. His statements as to other Truths of Faith (denied in later ages) are only by the way, and are generally incidental to the course of his historical narrative. This, it seems important to observe, gives them an even greater polemical value than would have been theirs had Optatus written controversially on these subjects, and been contradicted by Donatists or any other Christians then living. But this is far from being the case. For example, St. Optatus is able to write to his opponent: 'Bene revocasti Claves ad Petrum.'[2] Similarly, with regard to all the other Catholic doctrines to which he makes reference throughout his work, it is quite clear that he and Parmenian are standing on common ground, and were perfectly agreed.

When then we reflect that St. Optatus wrote in

[1] Optatus, ii, 2. [2] *id.* i, 12.

the century preceding the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, in the very heart of what are sometimes known as 'Primitive Times,' when we remember that he was anterior to Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome and Leo the Great, when we recall the fact that the Reformation in Germany and England does not yet go back four hundred years, but that Optatus wrote six centuries before the Norman set foot on our English soil, and that some thousand years and then two hundred more were to elapse between the writings of Optatus and the breach with Rome over King Henry's divorce, it is a most striking and moving fact that this old Father of the Church bears his express and unequivocal witness not only to the necessity of union with the *Cathedra Petri*, but also to most of those Catholic Doctrines so violently assailed in the days of Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Cranmer, Knox and their associates, and still denied on all sides around us.

For example, St. Optatus affirms explicitly the truth of Baptismal Regeneration [1]; again and again makes reference to the Sacrifice of the Altar [2]; states the doctrine of the Real Presence in words that are incapable of any misunderstanding [3]; insists on the sacredness of the Holy Chrism [4]; writes of the adornment of altars for the offering of the Sacrifice [5]; refers to the ceremony of Exorcism before Baptism [6]; appeals to deutero-canonical Books as to authentic Scripture [7];

[1] Optatus, v, 1 etc.
[2] *id.* i, 19; ii, 4; ii, 12; iii, 4 etc.
[3] *id.* ii, 19; vi, 1.
[4] *id.* ii, 25; iii, 4; vii, 4 etc.
[5] *id.* iii, 12.
[6] *id.* iv, 6.
[7] *id.* ii, 25 iv, 8. (Cf. Pseudo-Optatus B.)

takes the continuance of Miracles in the Church for granted[1]; and is quite express in his references to cloistered Virginity and the difference between the Commandments of God and Counsels of Perfection.[2] Sometimes indeed he is so modern in his expressions (or at least his words are so directly applicable to our modern circumstances) that when we first read them we rub our eyes and ask ourselves 'Can it be a Catholic writer of the fourth century, whom we are reading, not one of the twentieth?' Instances of this may be found in the famous description of the origin of the Donatist schism,[3] which, as Cardinal Wiseman has pointed out,[4] can be paralleled with startling exactness by the schism under Henry; or again in such isolated expressions as '*Cathedra ducit ad se Angelum*,' which is all that we need should it be urged that it is safe to remain in Anglicanism, because of the (supposed) validity of Anglican Orders. If these Orders were ever so valid, they could not be more valid than were those of the Donatists; but St. Optatus teaches us that, by themselves, valid Orders are of no avail. It is useless to have a Bishop (*Angelus*) who is out of communion with that One Chair of Peter, of which Optatus is at the time writing. Orders he may have, still he remains visibly in schism. *Cathedra ducit ad se Angelum*.[5] Or, similarly, 'Per Cathedram Petri, quae nostra est, *per ipsam* et ceteras dotes

[1] Optatus, ii, 19. [2] *id.* vi, 4. [3] *id.* i, 19.

[4] In the Article entitled *Anglican Claim for Apostolical Succession* first published in the *Dublin Review* for August 1839, and republished by the Catholic Truth Society, with a Preface by the late Dr. Rivington.

[5] Optatus, ii, 6.

apud nos esse probatum est.'[1] It is *through* the Chair of Peter—through our Union with that Chair which itself 'is ours,' that we derive and can prove our security as to the other Endowments of the Church, amongst which is reckoned lawful Episcopacy. Or, again, in discussion with any Protestant, what need we say more than those three words of St. Optatus—'*Catholica prior est*'[2]? Before any Protestant body had its birth, before Luther's turbulent spirit began to trouble the peace of Christendom, before the ecclesiastical Provinces of Canterbury and York were torn away by the State from their union with the Apostolic See, before the ambition of Photius separated Byzantium from the elder Rome, before Donatism arose, there was the Catholic Church and the Chair of Peter. *Catholica prior est.*

It is beyond doubt that, as Vincent of Lerins taught in the fifth century, and as Catholic theologians have since taught in every age, there must be a certain development of doctrine in the Church—that is to say, an 'explication' or unfolding, more and more explicit as the years pass on, of that which has always been implicit in the Deposit of the Faith delivered in the beginning to the Saints; for, where there is life, there must also be growth. Yet, whilst studying St. Optatus I have asked myself whether *since his day* there has been room for any *real* development. Whatever development of *doctrine* may have been necessary, at least with regard to the doctrines concerning the Holy See and the Eucharist, seems to me, as I read

[1] Optatus, ii, 9. [2] *id.* vii, 5.

Optatus, to have already taken place and to be generally well known and accepted throughout the Church.

The work, then, of St. Optatus derives its great doctrinal importance from its unambiguous teaching, principally indeed as to the marks of the Church, but also concerning other revealed truths, unhappily denied in modern times by great bodies of Christians separated from the Catholic Unity.

There are two subjects, the treatment of which by St. Optatus will probably jar upon the sensibilities of most, if not all, modern readers : the first is religious persecution, and the second the application of certain passages in the Old Testament, in minute and even verbal detail, to the controversies of his day.

With regard to persecution, the Donatists continually upbraided the Catholics with the punishments inflicted upon their fathers by Macarius and Leontius and other officers sent by the Emperors to secure religious unity. Now, the reply of St. Optatus up to a point is curiously similar to that which we make to-day when we are reminded of what happened in England under Mary Tudor. St. Optatus urged in the first place that these punishments had been greatly exaggerated (just as we say when confronted with Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'). In the second place he pointed out (as we do) that those who were punished were for the most part turbulent conspirators against the public security, and that their treatment of Catholics had been infinitely worse than any reprisals to which it may have led. Thirdly he laid stress

upon the fact (and here again we take precisely the same ground) that whatever happened came to pass by the authority of the State, and not by that of the Church, and that the Church was in no way responsible. If he had stopped here, all would have been well, but unfortunately St. Optatus went further, and argued that 'perchance' the sufferings of the Donatists were 'by the will of God,' and endeavoured to justify them by several parallels from the Old Testament. This is, it seems to us, exceedingly regrettable, but we must remember that to Optatus, it was an axiom, and as such seemed a truism which no man would or could dispute, that it was the duty of a Christian State to secure the observance of the true religion, and to punish not only offences against society, but also those against Almighty God. The modern distinction, so clear to us, between 'crime' and 'sin' was utterly unknown to him, and no doubt, if it had been stated in his hearing, would have seemed to him—at least in the case of a Christian State—utterly immoral and involving the gravest dereliction of duty on the part of a Christian ruler. We know from his own letters that it so appeared to Constantine.[1] When this fact is grasped, it will be more easy to understand a point of view, which is inapplicable to any set of circumstances that can be imagined as arising in modern times. All that can be said fairly on this subject, even by those who think St. Optatus most mistaken and wrong, is that unfortunately he was not ahead of his age.

[1] Cf. Appendix, pp. 398, 400, 406.

But it is not only with reference to the punishment of schismatics that the appeal of St. Optatus to the Old Testament will strike us as strange and sometimes even perverse. Again and again, when arguing against some Donatist custom or personage, he quotes a passage from Ezekiel, or Daniel, or Isaiah, as though Donatus the Great or the sacrileges of his followers had been before the mind of the Hebrew Prophet. This to us (at least to me)—however ingenious it may sometimes be—is tiresome and irritating in the extreme. But we must remember that of course St. Optatus did not think or mean anything of the kind. What he did mean was that Almighty God, when inspiring His Prophet, intended that Prophet's words to be applied (amongst other ways) to the case of the Donatists. All the Fathers of the time (indeed all Christians) held a theory of verbal dictation of the inspired writings, which has never been taught officially by the Church and has long been practically unknown amongst Catholics. Moreover, in the fourth and fifth centuries it was generally believed that Holy Scripture had many senses in addition to the literal or first sense. Consequently all ecclesiastical writers during those centuries used the text of Scripture from time to time in a way that will inevitably seem to us to be most far-fetched and unreal. But if this treatment of the Bible so appears to us, it would not have thus appeared to the contemporaries of Optatus. Indeed it is highly probable that many Donatists were much impressed and even converted by his appeal against them couched in the very words of some great

Hebrew Prophet. And if St. Optatus is sometimes insulting to the Donatists in his application of Holy Scripture, it is clear that often—this is certainly true of the *muscae morituraе* in Book VII and of all the passages dealt with in Book IV—he is merely retorting arguments that had been used against Catholics by Parmenian or other Donatists. Evidently, it did not seem to him safe to leave those arguments, so far as they consisted of quotations from Scripture, to answer themselves, and St. Optatus knew, as we cannot possibly know, the mentality of those men of his own day, for whose sake he was writing his work.

However, such an exegesis of Scripture is so alien to our habits of thought that it may draw the attention of the reader away from the real and great excellences of Optatus to a sense of mere annoyance at what will seem to be now and again his perversity of interpretation. (In fairness it should be said that, so far as this is true of Optatus, it is true also often of St. Ambrose and sometimes even of St. Augustine.) In my anxiety that there should be nothing to hinder the study of the really important and interesting parts of the work of St. Optatus, I thought for a moment of excluding his applications of the Old Testament to the circumstances of the Donatist schism. But a very little consideration made me see that such a course was out of the question, and that if I translated St. Optatus at all I must translate every word, so that it would be impossible for anyone to think that Optatus had been bowdlerised or mutilated at my hands. He is great enough to be read in his entirety and reckoned with as

a whole. The reader may be certain that I have translated—for him to read, if he likes—everything without exception as it stands in the Seven Books of Optatus, as he submitted them to the judgement of his own time.

St. Optatus can often be usefully illustrated from St. Cyprian and St. Augustine; occasionally from St. Jerome and Tertullian. I am aware that I have laid myself open to criticism by sometimes supplying references to the writings of these Fathers in their original; sometimes in a translation. I can but explain that considerations of space made it impossible to give them both in Latin and English. It only remained to do what seemed to me the more useful in each case. Sometimes I thought it safer to sacrifice the vernacular for the sake of giving the exact words of my authority (after all my footnotes are hardly likely to be read by many persons without a knowledge of Latin); sometimes, however, I felt it important to give the quotation in a form which all can understand. I can only plead that I have exercised my judgement to the best of my ability, and have always translated with faithfulness.

I much wished to present the Latin text. But that could not have been done without doubling the size and expense of my book. I have, however, always given the Latin in a note in three cases: (1) when any controversial point was involved, (2) when there was any doubt lingering in my mind as to the exact meaning of my author, (3) when I thought that my English version was somewhat free.

St. Optatus is by no means easy to translate. His

sentences are often very long and involved. Not seldom he loses his thread and *anacolutha* are frequent. Often too he is very crabbed and obscure. I have been most anxious, and I hope careful, to observe the two golden rules of faithful translation: firstly, to put *no* idea in the rendering which is not clearly in the text, and secondly to express *every* thought and phrase of the author in words that are as nearly as one can make them the equivalent of his own. To secure these two points I have never hesitated, when necessary, to sacrifice idiomatic English to literalness in translation. Few things are more exasperating than is a French paraphrase, which so often is as misleading with regard to the exact sense of its supposed original, as it is charming in its own beauty and delicacy of expression.

The style of Optatus is often majestic, always full of force and vigour, and sometimes rises to heights of real eloquence. There is one peculiarity of the African Latin of the time which, until we are accustomed to it, creates a difficulty and therefore perhaps here requires a word of notice. It is not too much to say that Optatus had no idea of the sequence of tenses observed by the classical authors, or even of any distinction in meaning between the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive. This is often noticeable in St. Augustine, but even more so in St. Optatus. Optatus uses these tenses quite indifferently and often linked together in the same sentence, without any reference to the question of time. On the other hand, his Latin is often most musical; he had a very sensitive ear for rhythm and euphony (it is often a delight to

read aloud his sonorous sentences for the very joy of listening to their sound), and accordingly he will use the pluperfect subjunctive where we should expect the imperfect, merely because of the cadence. If *proposuisset* will finish a sentence more imposingly and rhythmically than *proponeret, proposuisset* will inevitably fall from his pen. Our only guide, as to whether it should be translated 'he would propose' or 'he would have proposed,' is the sense of the context. As soon as we have become at all conversant with the writings of St. Optatus we shall be accustomed to this peculiarity, and it ceases to trouble us. It might well be otherwise with anyone who has never read the original. He would naturally be much surprised to see a Latin imperfect given in a note, but translated in the text by an English verb in the pluperfect, or *vice versa*. For this reason I have thought it well to give this explanation in advance.

It remains to say a few words about the occasion of this treatise and its date; we must also state what is known of Optatus and of Parmenian, the Donatist, to whom these Books are addressed.

St. Optatus himself tells us the origin of his work.[1] As the Donatists at the time refused a conference or public discussion with Catholics, it seemed desirable to answer them in writing. Accordingly Optatus determined to reply to a book which had recently appeared, written by a certain Parmenian. This Parmenian, about the year 350, had become the Donatist

[1] Optatus. i, 4.

Bishop of Carthage, in succession to Donatus, the successor of Majorinus, who had commenced all the trouble by allowing himself to be intruded into the See already occupied by Caecilian, the lawful Catholic Bishop. So we find Optatus writing to Parmenian of Majorinus as his *avus*, and reproaching him with sitting in the '*Cathedra Pestilentiae*' on which Majorinus was the first to sit.[1] Optatus tells us that Parmenian was not an African, but a stranger to Carthage.[2] Besides the book against the Catholic Church which St. Optatus here answers, Parmenian wrote another against a fellow-Donatist named Tichorinus, which was, in its turn, answered by St. Augustine. Of these two works of Parmenian, Du Pin writes in his Preface: 'Diversa utriusque operis divisio, diversus methodus, diversum argumentum, quamquam eadem utrobique in Ecclesiam Catholicam convitia legerentur.'

We are able to gather the date of the work of St. Optatus from internal evidence. St. Optatus himself tells us[3] that when he wrote his book more than sixty years had elapsed since the storms of persecution burst over all Africa. Now, the persecution of Diocletian (which without doubt is here referred to) began early in 303 and ceased in the East in 305. Again, whilst St. Optatus terms Photinus 'a heretic of this present time,'[4] St. Jerome tells us that Photinus died in the year 376. Putting these two dates—that of the cessation of the Diocletian persecution and the death of Photinus—together, and bearing the words of Optatus concerning them in mind, we gather that he wrote

[1] Optatus, i, 10. [2] i, 5. [3] i, 13. [4] iv, 5.

after 365 and before 376. But we can narrow it still further, for St. Jerome also tells us that Optatus wrote when Valentinian and Valens were Emperors. Valentinian was elected Emperor in 372, and died in 375. Between these years therefore St. Optatus published the first edition of his work. I say *the first edition*, for the following considerations seem to make it certain that he subsequently brought out his work anew with considerable additions, directed against the cavils with which the Donatists had met its publication.[1] In the list of Popes[2] we now find the name of Siricius given after that of Damasus. But Siricius was not raised to the Supreme Pontificate until 384, some years after the death of both Valentinian and Valens. It is, therefore, quite certain that Optatus could not possibly have written in the lifetime of these Emperors, that 'together with the whole Catholic world' he was then 'united with Siricius in the bonds of communion.'[3] Moreover, Optatus gives us not only a list of the Popes from St. Peter, but also a list of the Donatist anti-Popes from Victor Garbensis (the first of the series) to Macrobius.[4] Of this Macrobius he writes as of one still living, and calls him the *socius* of Parmenian. Later on, however, in the same chapter Optatus gives the names of two obscure anti-Popes, Lucianus and Claudianus (otherwise unknown to history), who had succeeded Macrobius in the Donatist line. These names, like that of Pope Siricius, must necessarily have been added after the work had

[1] Cf. vii, 1, and my Introduction to Book vii.
[2] Optatus, ii, 3. [3] ii, 4. [4] ii, 4.

been finished and first given to the world. We may, therefore, safely conclude that Optatus wrote his Six Books against Parmenian about the year 373, when Valentinian and Valens were Emperors, during the Pontificate of Damasus. But he lived on until the time when Siricius was Pope and Theodosius Emperor, and then brought out a new edition of his work up to date, and no doubt added in some shape or other the chapters which now constitute his Seventh Book.[1]

Concerning the life of St. Optatus hardly anything is known, but he has always been held in honour in the Church by reason of the tradition concerning the sanctity of his life, as well as the vigour and learning with which he defended the Faith. Thus St. Fulgentius joins his name with those of Augustine and Ambrose, and writes as follows: 'Sive quod Sanctus Ambrosius, sive quod Sanctus Augustinus, sive quod Sanctus Optatus senserunt a nobis quoque salva veritate fidei sentiatur.'[2] St. Augustine too joins together St. Ambrose and St. Optatus as authorities, writing, 'doctrinam quam commendavit Milevitanus Optatus vel Mediolanensis Ambrosius.'[3] In another place St. Augustine appeals to St. Optatus as the great authority for the history of the Donatist schism, and describes him as 'Venerabilis memoriae Milevitanus Episcopus Catholicae Communionis Optatus.'[4] Concerning the accuracy of St. Optatus as an historian there has never been any more doubt than as to his orthodoxy and learning as a theologian. His work was,

[1] *See* Introduction to Book vii.
[2] *Ad Monimum* ii, 13.
[3] *De Unitate Ecclesiae* xix, 50.
[4] *Con. Ep. Parm.* i, 13.

as he himself tells us and St. Augustine bears witness,[1] richly documented and was never controverted on any side. Indeed there is an amusing story given by St. Augustine and still to be found in the *Gesta Collationis Carthaginensis* as to how the Donatist Bishops appealed to his authority concerning Constantine's refusal to allow Caecilian to return immediately to his See, and the way in which the laugh was turned against them when the whole passage was read aloud.[2]

We know from St. Jerome that Optatus was an African by birth,[3] and from St. Augustine that he was a convert to the Faith. Augustine's beautiful words on this subject may well be quoted ; they seem to lose the fragrant delicacy of their aroma if any attempt be made to translate them : 'Nonne aspicimus quanto auro et argento et veste sussarcinatus exierit de Aegypto Cyprianus Doctor suavissimus et Martyr beatissimus ; quanto Lactantius, quanto Victorinus, Optatus, Hilarius, ut de vivis taceam ! '[4]

Here the names of Optatus, Lactantius and Cyprian are brought together—three great African converts—by a fourth, Augustine, the greatest of them all. And if, as is undoubted, Augustine, himself 'rich with the spoils of the Egyptians,' owed much also to Optatus, Optatus owed even more to Cyprian. We see the influence of St. Cyprian throughout the writings of Optatus, though, like Augustine after him, Optatus

[1] *Con. Ep. Parm.* i, 13.

[2] *In Breviculo Collationis* xx, 38 (cf. Migne *Capitula Collationis Carthaginensis diei tertiae*, 375, 477 et seq. usque ad 539, et *Epistola Concilii Zertensis* apud S. Augustinum cxli, 9).

[3] *De Doctrina Christiana*, Lib. II. xl, 61. [4] *Ib.*

did not fear to desert Cyprian, where (as in the question of the re-baptism of heretics) Cyprian was wrong.

To overestimate the influence of Cyprian on the Church in Africa in the fourth century is hardly possible. By his sanctity, by his learning, above all by his heroic martyrdom, Cyprian had won for himself a position which was unique in the veneration and affection of the Faithful. For this reason the works of St. Cyprian were continually appealed to by the Donatists. Petilian quoted them against St. Augustine, as in the days of Optatus they had already been quoted by Parmenian.

The Canon of Scripture was fixed by Pope St. Damasus whilst St. Optatus was very likely still alive, and (whatever we may think of the use that Optatus sometimes made of the sacred text) there is no doubt of the veneration in which he held the inspired writings. On occasion, we must admit, he quoted them with inaccuracy; from which it follows that he must have quoted by heart. But he (or rather a writer who lived not many years later) tells us that the MSS. were numerous in his time and 'in the hands of all.'[1] Optatus probably knew neither Greek nor Hebrew. He employed a pre-Hieronymian version (African in form, but less typically so than that used by St. Cyprian), to the very words of which (even in the

[1] 'Librorum milia ubique recitantur . . . bibliothecae refertae sunt libris . . . manus omnium codicibus plenae sunt.' (See B, p. 305.) Harnack (*Bible Reading in the Early Church*, p. 97, note 1, English translation) quotes these words as those of Optatus. I think, however, that there can be no doubt that they are really pseudo-Optatus. (See my Introduction to Book vii, p. 272.)

translation) he seems to have ascribed inspiration. But surely it is far better to honour the text of the Written Word of God too much than too little, and in this, as in so many other things, St. Optatus may, if we will, be to us, in these days of Modernism, both an example and an inspiration.

Nothing is known as to the exact date or place of his death. Throughout Christendom there are magnificent temples raised to the honour of Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine; in memory of Cyprian there is a famous Chapel in the Catacombs; in no land—so far as I have been able to discover—is there even an altar raised to Heaven under the invocation of Optatus of Milevis. For him there is no public *cultus* anywhere amongst the Faithful in the Church of God. But he lives in his work—a monument of his zeal for the Catholic Faith and for Catholic Unity. No Catholic, having once read this book, and having therein entered into the loyal, upright, devoted, strenuous, somewhat impetuous spirit of its author—a Bishop who threw himself whole-heartedly into the fight that he knew to be necessary; a formidable and on occasion hard-hitting champion of Religion; a good shepherd who knew not guile and hated schism, but loved the Peace which, as he tells us, Christ bequeathed as a keepsake to His children; who loved the Unity of the Church which alone can secure that Peace for those who will seek and ensue it; who loved the Chair of Peter and the safety of his flock better far than he loved aught on earth beside—but will recognise to the full the justice of the simple words of the Roman Martyrology which

on the fourth of each recurring June commemorate this single-minded servant of God,

*Milevi in Numidia Sancti Optati Episcopi doctrina et sanctitate conspicui.*

'He being dead yet speaketh.'

---

At least six manuscripts of St. Optatus are in existence (all of them in a more or less incomplete state), and were consulted by Ziwsa. We shall refer to them as A, B, C, G, P, R, respectively.

A = Orléans, Bibliothèque de la ville, 169 (seventh century—only a fragment).

B = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1712, formerly in the Library of Baluze, 290 (fourteenth century).

C = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1711, formerly in Colbert's Library (eleventh century).

G = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 13335, once in the Library of St. Germain-des-Prés, 609 (1248), (fifteenth century).

P = Petrograd, Imperial Public Library, Lat. 25 Q.v. omd. I. 2 (fifth or sixth century).

R = Reims, Bibliothèque de la ville, 221 (olim 138) (beginning of ninth century).

Of these manuscripts, P is the most ancient and undoubtedly the most valuable. Unfortunately it is extant for the first two Books only. For the other Books R is the best authority. Ziwsa, however, seems to think that some of the various readings in G may represent changes made by St. Optatus himself in his second edition; from this point of view (late though

it is) G becomes very important. A is too fragmentary to be of much service; it is extant for the first two chapters of the Seventh Book only. To C we owe all that remains of the Appendix; unhappily it commences in its present state only about the middle of the Sixth Book. Ziwsa holds B in small account, and Du Pin tells us that it is *valde mendosus*.

The *Editio Princeps* of Optatus was printed at Metz in 1549 by Cochlaeus, a Canon of Warsaw. He dedicated his book to the Abbot of Tongerloo, in the hope that in the splendid library of that renowned Abbey some manuscript might be discovered, whereby his text might be corrected, since he had at his disposal only a MS. of the fifteenth century, full of faults, which is known as *Codex Cusanus*. Ziwsa was unable to examine it. Cochlaeus himself says of this *Codex* that it was 'ex antiquo codice quopiam mendose ab indocto librario scriptum et ab alio deinceps multo adhuc mendosius rescriptum.' Poor material indeed upon which to work! The *Editio Princeps* of Optatus is referred to as *v*.

Fourteen years later, in 1563, a new edition was brought out by Francis Balduinus, who tells us that in the edition of Cochlaeus there were more mistakes than sentences, at which, under the circumstances, we can hardly be surprised. Balduinus had a hitherto unknown MS., which was lent him by a Paris theologian, at his disposal, but the text was still exceedingly corrupt, until in the year 1569 he was able to produce a much better edition, since by this time he had access to two new MSS. neither of which is available to us.

The second of these MSS., known as Codex Tilianus, from the name of a Bishop of Meaux to whom it belonged, contains the passages in Book VII. which are now generally held to be spurious, and which Balduinus was the first to print. He brought out yet another edition in 1599. This third edition of Balduinus possesses some valuable notes by its author, and is quoted as *b*.

Three more editions were brought out in the next century: the first, full of mistakes, prepared by Albaspinaeus, Bishop of Orleans, and published after his death in 1631. This same year the Anglican scholar Casaubon published in London an edition of Optatus, but could only use *b*, as he was unable to consult any manuscripts. This edition, therefore, abounds in conjectural emendations, many of them highly ingenious, which, apart from any intrinsic probability that they may possess, receive importance from the critical acumen and learning of their author.

Yet another edition was published by Priorius in Paris, but it is of no value whatsoever. The text is that of the *first* edition of Balduinus.

We now come to the great work of Du Pin, the famous Gallican theologian. Du Pin brought out his edition of Optatus in 1700, again at Amsterdam in 1701, and in an improved form at Antwerp in 1702. He discovered the important MSS CBG, and was thus able to make the first serious attempt to restore the correct text of Optatus in the many places where it had become corrupt. He added notes of his own, and also printed anew those of Casaubon, Albaspinaeus,

Barthius and Balduinus. He is the author of the concise marginal summary of the contents of each chapter, prefixed a Preface and a History of the Donatist schism to the text of Optatus, and appended many valuable documents in various ways illustrative of Donatism, as well as the *Gesta Collationis Carthaginensis,* so far as they exist, in full.

For nearly two hundred years nothing fresh was done for Optatus, until, as we have already stated, at the end of the nineteenth century Ziwsa published his critical edition. He had the advantage not only of the labours of his predecessors, but also for the first two Books he had access to P, which was unknown to all of them. Ziwsa gives us the various readings, but was precluded by the rule of the Vienna Academy for the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum* from providing other footnotes. He has, however, contributed a long Preface, dealing exclusively with questions concerning the text, as well as two valuable Indices, the first *Nominum et Rerum,* the second *Verborum et Locutionum S. Optati.*

In my translation I have generally followed Ziwsa's text, but have not been afraid to desert it, if I thought that I saw good reason—especially when Ziwsa himself has deserted P. The different readings will always be found in a footnote, unless they are of absolutely no consequence. I have (as will be seen) freely availed myself of the notes furnished by Du Pin, especially of his own and of those of Casaubon. But it is strange how often those passages in Optatus which seem to me to present most difficulty and have

caused the greatest uncertainty in my mind as to their precise meaning have been left untouched by all the commentators, without any explanation whatever.

In conclusion I must express my deepest sense of obligation to Dom John Chapman, O.S.B. With unfailing kindness and generosity he has corrected my work throughout, whilst it was yet in manuscript. To him I owe numerous suggestions. Without his aid I should never have ventured to undertake a task which has been to me a delightful labour, full of unexpected interest on every page. My hope is that many others may, through this English work, go if possible to the Latin, or may, in any case, fall happily under that which to me it is no exaggeration to term the spell and fascination of St. Optatus of Milevis.

# CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE . . . . . v

THE SEVEN BOOKS OF ST. OPTATUS OF MILEVIS AGAINST THE DONATISTS.

BOOK THE FIRST

WHO WERE THE BETRAYERS AT THE TIME OF THE PERSECUTION. THE CAUSES OF THE SCHISM. WHERE AND BY WHOM THE SCHISM WAS MADE . . . . . 1–56

BOOK THE SECOND

WHICH IS THE ONE TRUE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND WHERE IS IT TO BE FOUND? THE FIVE ENDOWMENTS OF THE CHURCH BELONG TO CATHOLICISM, NOT TO THE SCHISM. THE DONATISTS HAVE BEEN GUILTY OF SHAMELESSLY SCRAPING THE HEADS OF PRIESTS, AND OF MURDERS, OF GIVING THE EUCHARIST TO DOGS, AND OF CASTING AWAY THE HOLY CHRISM . . . . . 57–119

BOOK THE THIRD

THE FOUR REASONS ON ACCOUNT OF WHICH IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO BRING ABOUT UNITY WITHOUT SEVERITY.

BECAUSE THE SCHISMATICS HAD BUILT CHURCHES 'THAT WERE NOT WANTED.'

BECAUSE DONATUS OF CARTHAGE HAD APPEALED TO THE EMPEROR TO BRING ABOUT UNITY.

PAGE

Because Donatus of Bagaia collected Bands of Armed Men to stop the Work of Unity.

Because none of those Things with which the Work of Unity has been reproached came to pass in Opposition to the Will of God . . . 120–179

Book the Fourth

An Answer is made to certain Arguments of Parmenian, drawn from various Passages in the Old Testament . . . . . 180–202

Book the Fifth

In this Fifth Book it is shown that though Men are the Ministers of Baptism, it is God Who cleanses, and that it is His Christ Who gives what is received in Baptism, and that the Rebaptised cannot possess the Kingdom of God, and that they have lost the Wedding Garment . . . . . 203–245

Book the Sixth

In this Book it is shown that the Donatist Bishops wickedly destroyed Altars, that they sold the Holy Vessels, and without Warrant stripped Nuns of their Veils . . . . . 246–268

Book the Seventh

In this last Book it is shown that the Children of the Betrayers, whose Names were given in the First Book, may now, for the Sake of Unity, be received back into the Catholic Communion . . 275–297

PSEUDO-OPTATUS.

A . . 298 | B . . 305 | C . . 310

A Hundred Noteworthy Sayings of St. Optatus . . . . . 311

## APPENDIX

PAGE

PREFACE TO APPENDIX . . . . . 321

I.—The Acts of the Vindication of Felix, Bishop of Aptunga . . . . . 327

II.—The Proceedings before Zenophilus . . . 346

III.—Letter of Constantine to Aelafius . . . 382

IV.—Letter of the Council of Arles to Pope Sylvester 388

V.—Letter of Constantine to the Catholic Bishops . 393

VI.—Letter of Constantine to the Donatist Bishops . 399

VII.—Letter of Prefects to Celsus . . . . . 401

VIII.—Letter of Constantine to Celsus . . . 403

IX.—Letter of Constantine to the Bishops and People of Africa . . . . . 407

X.—A Rescript of Constantine . . . . . 410

XI.—Acts of the Council of Cirta . . . . 416

XII.—Letter of the Proconsul Anulinus to Constantine 420

XIII.—Letter of Constantine to Pope Miltiades . . 422

XIV.—Letter of Constantine to Probianus . . . 425

XV.—Letter of Constantine to Anulinus (I). . . 428

XVI.—Letter of Constantine to Anulinus (II). . . 430

# THE WORK OF ST. OPTATUS THE AFRICAN

## BISHOP OF MILEVIS

# ON THE SCHISM OF THE DONATISTS AGAINST PARMENIAN

## BOOK THE FIRST

### WHO WERE THE BETRAYERS AT THE TIME OF THE PERSECUTION. THE CAUSES OF THE SCHISM. WHERE AND BY WHOM THE SCHISM WAS MADE.

ONE Faith,[1] most honoured brethren,[2] commends[3]

I. The Divine Gift of Peace, bestowed upon all Christians.

[1] *Cunctos nos Christianos, clarissimi fratres, Omnipotenti Deo fides una commendat.* With these striking words St. Optatus opens his work against the Donatists. *Fides una*—the One Faith, untainted by any specific heresy. St. Optatus insists more than once, with emphasis, that he does not charge those against whom he writes with heresy (sin against faith), but with schism (sin against unity) (cf. i, 9; i, 12; iii, 9; v, 1), and complains (i, 10) that Parmenian paid no attention to this essential distinction. St. Augustine, however, in his second Book against Cresconius explains the reasons why the Donatists of his time deserved to be called heretics, and in his Book on Heresies he hardly ever gives them any other name, explaining at length that their schism had now become a heresy. In this it did but follow a usual law. 'Haeresis scisma inveteratum.' These are the words of St. Augustine, and St. Jerome writes to the same effect: (*Ep. ad Tit.* iii) 'An erroneous doctrine constitutes

us all, who are Christians, to the keeping of Almighty God. To this Faith it appertains to believe that the Son of God, the Lord,[1] shall come to judge the world—that He, who has already come, has been born, according to His Human Nature, through[2] Mary a Virgin, that He has suffered, died, and (after having been buried) has risen from the grave.

heresy; schism is separation from the Church, through the departure of a Bishop (or of Bishops). But there is no schism which fails to frame for itself some heresy, that it may form a pretext for having departed from the Church.' St. Augustine tells us further that Donatus the Great was heretical about the Trinity, though the fact was generally unknown to his followers. He also writes (*Ep.* clxiii) that he had heard that the Arians had endeavoured to make common cause with Donatists in Africa.

[2] *fratres.* St. Optatus will proceed immediately to justify himself at considerable length for terming the Donatists his *brethren*, notwithstanding the fact that they were schismatics, and therefore his 'separated brethren' (i, 3; cf. iv, 1; iv, 2). So also St. Augustine: 'Quotidie enim quibusdam non nobiscum in una Ecclesia, nec in iisdem Sacramentis constitutis, dicimus, *Frater.* Sodomitis etiam dixit Loth, *Fratres* (Gen. xix, 7), utique ad leniendum eorum animositatem, non ad cognitam fraternitatem, quasi unius haereditate consortium.' (*Gesta Collationis Carthag. diei* iii, ccxlii). Cf. Aug. *cont. Parm.* iii, 2.

[3] *commendat.* Ziwsa says that *commendat* here = *tutelae Dei mandat* (cf. the prayer of the Church, e.g. in Fest. S. Antonii, 'Intercessio nos, quaesumus Domine, beati Antonii Abbatis commendet'). Casaubon thinks that it means either: 'One Faith *approves* us all, who are Christians, to Almighty God' (i.e. makes us pleasing to Him); or 'One Faith *proves* that, in the sight of Almighty God, we all are Christians.' (Cf. S. August. *Brev. Coll.* iii, 10: 'Donatistae Scripturarum testimonio unam Ecclesiam commendaverant.' The Donatists had *proved* by the witness of the Scriptures that the Church is One.) It must, however, be admitted that it is not possible to produce a passage, at least from the works of St. Augustine, in which *commendare* is used in this sense with the Dative, as above *Omnipotenti Deo.*)

[1] Ziwsa following G reads *Filium Dei Dominum.* PRBvb have *Filium Dei Deum.*

[2] G reads *ex.* All the other MSS. have *per.*

Also, before ascending to Heaven, whence He had descended,[1] He left behind, through His Apostles, as His parting gift,[2] to all Christians, Peace.[3]

[1] Cf. John iii, 13.

[2] *Itoriam* P. *Storiam* RB. *Victricem* G. This last reading is evidently a desperate, though brilliant guess ('He bequeathed victorious peace'). It is, however, adopted by Du Pin, who observes that it seems impossible to translate *storiam*. Ziwsa reads *storiam*, and tells us that it here means not as usually, a carpet, but a breastplate (*Schutzwehr*) ('He left peace as a breastplate'). Du Pin (not knowing P) did not see *Itoriam*. Evidently Ziwsa put it aside as a hopeless corruption. Yet without doubt it is the true reading, for, as Dom John Chapman O.S.B. has pointed out to me, this word has been discovered with its explanation by the learned Dom Germain Morin O.S.B. in an unpublished sermon of St. Augustine (see *Revue Bénéd.* 1895 xii, p. 388). 'Loquebatur cum Apostolis suis ascensurus. Videamus qualia illis reliquit, sicut dici solet ITORIA. Humanae conditionis est quod dico, ut quando ab amicis amici deducuntur (are conducted a little way on their departure), quando ille qui deducitur discedere caeperit, quia necesse est ut relinquat in animo diligentium se nonnullam tristitiam, dat eis aliquid pecuniae, unde illis eadem dies, sicut dicitur, bene sit, id est, unde convivant, simul laetentur et iucundentur. Et haec quantulacunque pecunia quae datur, hilari nomine ITORIA nuncupatur (This small sum of money is jokingly called 'Journey Money'). Quid dimisit Dominus Ihesus discipulis suis? Exultate, adtentite, quia ITORIA illa non solum illos inebriavit, sed ad nos usque manebit . . . (and further on) Eritis Mihi testes in Ierusalem. Primo ibi, ubi sum occisus, ibi ero gloriosus. In Ierusalem et in totam Iudaeam et Samariam. Et adhuc parum est. Et usque in totam terram. O! ITORIA!' Thus we have two forms of *Itoria* (1) neuter plural with *qualia* and by itself, (2) feminine singular *itoria illa . . . inebriavit*. Evidently it is an adjectival form, in popular use (*sicut dici solet, itoria*), and doubtful number (1) as a substantive = neuter plural, (2) in feminine *illa itoria*, (*sc. pecunia*). St. Augustine makes Our Lord's *itoria* (parting gift) to His disciples and to His Church (*ad nos usque manebit*) the right of preaching throughout the world; St. Optatus (in accordance with the purpose of his treatise) makes it Peace. 'He left us Peace as His parting gift—to all of us, in the person of His Apostles.'

[3] St. Optatus throughout his work continually uses the word *Pax*, to express the visible unity and communion of the Faithful

And, lest it should seem that to His Apostles only He had left this Peace, He said:

'That which I say to you, I say to all.'[1]

And He also said:

'My peace I give unto you, My peace I leave unto you.'[2]

Thus we see that Peace has been given to all Christians.

That it is God's Peace, we know, inasmuch as He says 'My Peace.' But when He says 'I give to you,' we know that He willed that it should belong not only to Himself, but to all those as well who should believe in Him.

II. This Peace was disturbed by the Schism.

If this Peace had remained whole and inviolate[3] as it was given, and had not been disturbed by the authors of the schism, there would not be any disagreement to-day between us and our brethren, nor would they be causing God inconsolable tears (as Isaiah the prophet bears witness[4]), nor would they deserve the

in the Catholic Church; of course it also denotes their invisible union with God through grace.

[1] Mark xiii, 37. [2] John xiv, 27.

[3] *Quae Pax . . . integra inviolataque.* It is an interesting coincidence—but probably a coincidence only—that these last two words, applied by St. Optatus to God's Peace (by which he designates the Catholic Unity), are used in the Athanasian Creed of the Catholic Faith: 'Catholicam Fidem, quam nisi quisque *integram inviolatamque* servaverit.'

[4] The reference is to Isaiah xxii, 4: 'Therefore have I said: Depart from Me: I will weep bitterly: labour not to comfort Me for the devastation of the daughter of My people.' Optatus uses the same strong figure twice in iii, 2: 'In dolore Dei amare plorantis,' and again: 'Indicat Deus lacrymas suas quas vos fecistis, quas testatur nulla posse consolatione siccari,' with a reference to the same passage in Isaiah.

name, and do the deeds, of false prophets [1]; nor would they have built a crumbling and whitened wall [2]; nor would they overturn simple but too credulous minds; nor would they, by wickedly imposing hands [3] upon the heads of all, place upon them the veils of destruction [4]; nor would they speak evil things to God [5]; nor would they re-baptise the Faithful; nor should we now be grieving for the souls which they have either destroyed or slain,—souls of the innocent, for whom God was the first to grieve, saying by the mouth of Ezekiel the prophet:

'Woe to you who place a veil over every head and over every age, for the destruction of souls. The souls of My people have been destroyed; and they spoke evil things to Me amongst My people, that they might slay souls which ought not to die, whilst they proclaim to My people their empty deceits.' [6]

[1] *vatum* is in all the MSS. It has been suggested that it should be *fratrum* (cf. 2 Cor. xi, 27). But cf. iii, 10: 'parietem fecisse dicuntur falsi *vates*.'

[2] *nec ruinosum ac dealbatum extruerent parietem.* For the full meaning of this reference to Ezekiel xiii, 10, see iii, 10.

[3] In Penance.

[4] Cf. Ez. xiii, 18. It was strictly forbidden to impose the Veil of Penance upon the innocent, thus withdrawing them from the Communion of the Body of Christ, or, under any circumstances, upon Bishops or clergy, even though they might have been guilty of such a serious sin as that of apostasy.

[5] *nec maledicerent Deo*, i.e. by the exorcisms used by the Donatists when they rebaptised Catholics or subjected them to Penance. These Donatists are said by St. Optatus profanely to rail at, or speak evil things to, the Spirit of God. Optatus develops this thought in iv, 6 where he accuses the Donatists of saying to God—dwelling in the soul of the Catholic: '*Maledicte*, exi foras.' In both passages he refers to Ez. xiii, 19, where he reads '*maledicebant Mihi*.' (The Vulgate has '*violabant Me*.') Cf. also ii, 21: 'Quid iniquius quam exorcizare Spiritum Sanctum?'

[6] Ez. xiii, 18.

III. Why Schismatics should be called Brethren.

Lest any one should say, that without thought I call them brethren, I would reply that such they are, for we cannot escape from the words of the prophet Isaiah [1]; and, although they would not deny (as all men know well) that they hold us in abhorrence, and ban us utterly and are unwilling to be called our brethren,[2] still we may not depart from the fear of God, for the Holy Spirit exhorts us by Isaiah the prophet, saying:

'You who fear the Word of the Lord, hear ye the Word of the Lord.

'To those who detest and curse you, and are unwilling to be called your brethren,[3] say ye nevertheless:

'"You are our brethren."'[4]

They therefore are without doubt brothers, though not good brothers. Wherefore let no one marvel that I term those *brothers*, who are unable to escape being our brethren.[5] They and we have one spiritual birth, though widely differing is our conduct.

For even Ham, who mocked undutifully at his father's shame,[6] was the brother of the innocent. In

[1] Is. lxvi, 5.

[2] St. Augustine also bears witness (*con. Gaudent.* iii; *con. Parm.* iii, 2) that the Donatists repudiated the name of *Brothers* in their dealings with Catholics.

[3] *et nolunt se dici fratres vestros.* These words are interpolated by Optatus in the midst of his quotation, to make his sense clear.

[4] St. Optatus quotes here from the Septuagint Version; the same passage (also from the Septuagint) is quoted by Tertullian, *con. Marc.* iv, 16, and by St. Augustine *Lib. post Coll.* The Vulgate (from the Hebrew) conveys quite a different sense: *dixerunt fratres vestri odientes vos et abiicientes propter Nomen Meum.*

[5] They could not escape this, because by Baptism they had become Sons of God, and therefore brethren of all the brothers of Christ.

[6] Gen. ix, 22.

accordance with his deserts, he incurred the yoke of slavery, so that he—their brother—was assigned in bondage to his brethren. From this we see that, even where there is sin, the name of brotherhood is not lost.

Concerning the sins of these our brethren, I will speak in another place. For they, sitting over against us, speak[1] evil things about us.[2] They consort with that Thief[3] who robs God, and share their lot with adulterers[4] (that is, with heretics), and make their sins an object of praise,[5] and plan reproachful words against us Catholics.

IV. Why Optatus thought it well to undertake the task of refuting Parmenian's book.

They all—each in his own district—make a great noise with wicked words. To some of their statements I may reply when opportunity arises.[6] But we have found only one with whom it is possible to discuss these matters either by correspondence, or by the exchange of treatises—Parmenian our brother, if indeed he will allow us to call him brother. Since they are unwilling to be in communion, as we are, with

[1] *denotant.* Literally 'they brand us with infamy.' This is the reading of PG and gains added probability from the fact that St. Optatus twice (iv, 3; iv, 5) quotes Ps. xlix, 20 thus: '*Sedens adversus fratrem tuum denotabas.*' Du Pin says of *Denotant*' legunt sed male.' But we must never forget that Du Pin did not see P, and therefore looked upon *denotant* merely as an emendation of G, destitute of authority. The other MSS. have *detrahunt.*

[2] Ps. xlix, 19 et seq. (cf. iv, 5, where Optatus discusses this passage at length).

[3] Satan (cf. iv, 6).

[4] *moechis.* Optatus argues that *moechi* = *haeretici* in iv, 6. (Cf. i, 10.)

[5] *peccata sua laudant.*

[6] This sentence is not in PRBvb. It is only to be found in G.

the whole body of Bishops,[1] let it be freely granted that they are not colleagues, if they refuse so to be, but (as we have already said), brothers they are.

Now, my brother Parmenian, in order that he might not speak like the rest, in a windy [2] and unconvincing manner, has not only given utterance to his opinions in speech, but has also set them down in writing. Since, then, love of truth compels us [3] to answer what he has said, we may still have some sort of conference —even though we cannot meet together.[4]

By this means also the wishes of certain people will be satisfied. For many have often expressed a desire for a public discussion between champions drawn from both sides, in order to elicit the truth. And this might well have been done. At any rate, though the Donatists forbid their people to come to us, and close the way to any approach to us, and avoid a meeting,[5] and refuse to speak with us, let there be a conference, my brother Parmenian, between us two in this way, that, as I have not thought little of, nor

[1] *Collegium episcopale nolunt nobiscum habere commune.* 'Collegium episcopale,' the whole College of Bishops throughout the Catholic world.

[2] *ventose.* R has *venenose.*

[3] *veritate cogente compellimur.* We shall often find St. Optatus, as here, joining two synonyms together, (I suppose for strength of expression,) without a shade of difference in meaning.

[4] St. Augustine (*Ep.* clxvi) reminds the Donatists that their Bishops had always refused any conference with Catholics, (with whom as sinners they refused to speak,) and also (*Ep.* lxviii) not only that Paul had dealings with the Epicureans, but that Christ had conversed with Satan himself concerning the Law. Many years after the death of St. Optatus, the Donatists, though most unwillingly, were compelled by the Edict of the Emperor Honorius to have the great Conference with the Catholics at Carthage (A.D. 411).

[5] *consessum.*

despised, your treatises, which you have wished to be read and quoted by many, but on the contrary have patiently listened to everything that you have brought forward,—so do you, in your turn, attend to the reply which, with humility, I make to you.

V. The Nature of Parmenian's book.

Now I understand well, and you do not deny,—and every man, who is not a fool, will quite plainly see for himself—that you never would have written at such a length for any other purpose, excepting that you might, by your writings, strike an undeserved blow at the Catholic Church. But (as it has been given me to discover) whilst your wishes say one thing, your arguments shout another. Moreover, I perceive that not all that you have written is an argument against Catholicism.[1]

Indeed, though you are not a Catholic, what you say often tells in favour of the Catholic Church.[2] Therefore it will only be necessary for us to answer you when through wrong information you write, not of what you have yourself seen,[3] but of what you have heard from others speaking falsely (although we have read in the Epistle of Peter :

'Be ye unwilling to judge your brother without certainty'[4]).

[1] *contra Catholicam.* Tertullian (*Praescr.* 30) was the first Father to use *Catholica* as a substantive. This use ceases after the seventh century. We find it 240 times in St. Augustine.

[2] *immo multa pro Catholica, cum Catholicus non sis.*

[3] Cf. iii, 12 : 'Veritas perspecta oculis dulcedinem suam in se habens a falsae opinionis limitibus separata est' etc.

[4] We have here probably a paraphrase of James iv, 11. St. Optatus (no doubt quoting by heart) must have written *Petri* instead of *Jacobi* by a lapse either of pen or of memory.

For instance, amongst other things which have no reference to us (that they have no such reference I shall prove), you say that we asked for armed troops to be employed against you.

But in other parts of your treatise there are some things which tell in our favour, and against you—such are the analogy of the Flood, and that of Circumcision.[1]

Some things there are which tell both for us and for you. For example, what you have written in praise of Baptism (excepting that you have said untrue things concerning the Flesh of Christ) tells in your favour[2] as well as in ours, because, although you are outside, still, from us you went forth.

It would also be in favour of both sides—if you had not joined yourselves to those who are certainly schismatics[3]—that you have proved that heretics are strangers to Catholic Sacraments.[4]

Some things are arguments for us alone. Such is your reference to the One Church.

Some things that you have mentioned tell the wrong way for you, in consequence of your ignorance,

[1] Parmenian had argued that the Flood was a type, and Circumcision the forerunner, of Baptism. But this told in favour of Catholics and against the Donatists (who rebaptised) since there was only one Flood and only one Circumcision.

[2] Since Catholics admitted the validity of Baptism administered by Donatists.

[3] The Donatists, though not yet heretics, had by making or joining a schism, lost their right to the Sacraments of the Church.

[4] *extraneos esse Catholicis Sacramentis* = the Sacraments of the Catholic Church; cf. iii, 9 'de unitate Catholica' = the unity of the Catholic Church.

as a foreigner,[1] [of the facts]—for instance, your indictment of 'Betrayers'[2] and schismatics.

The way in which you have written concerning the Sacraments and Sacrifice,[3] offered by one who is in sin, also goes against you.

So, when we investigate, we discover that in reality you have brought nothing against us except your mistaken charge, that we asked to have troops employed against you. That this is a calumny we shall be able to prove to absolute demonstration. Take this calumny out of your book, and you are ours.

For what can be more to our purpose than your argument from the fact that there was only one Flood —the type of Baptism? And, in maintaining that the one[4] Circumcision availed for the salvation of the people of the Jews, you have written in defence of our doctrine, as though you were one of us. For this is *our* argument, who defend the Unity of Baptism conferred in [the Name of] the Trinity.[5] It is not an argument in favour of you, who dare to repeat, against

[1] *quia peregrinus es* (cf. iii, 3).

[2] *Traditorum.* The crime of *Traditio* was the betraying of the Sacred Books and Vessels under the stress of persecution. I have throughout translated *Traditores* '*Betrayers*' and *Traditio* '*Betrayal.*'

[3] *de oleo et sacrificio peccatoris. Oleum* is here used for the Sacraments, since Unction has from very early times been used in Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Order (cf. note 3, p. 109) and the Last Anointing. The reference is to Ps. cxl, 5: 'Oleum autem peccatoris non impinguet caput Meum.' (Cf. iv, 7, etc.)

[4] *singularem.* Cf. *Singulare Baptisma* (iii, 2; v, 1), *Singulare Sacramentum* (i, 11), *Singularis Cathedra* (ii, 2), and *Res singularis* (bis) (v, 10).

[5] Cf. ii, 10.

the laws,[1] that Baptism, of which the one Flood and one Circumcision are typical. And this, although you yourselves would not deny that what has been commanded to be done once only, ought not to be repeated. But whilst you have praised with acuteness that which is worthy of all praise,[2] you have by a quibble introduced your own persons, as if—since it is only lawful once [to baptise]—for you it were lawful, for others unlawful.[3]

If it be unlawful for Betrayers to baptise, it cannot be lawful for you, for we can prove that your first fathers were Betrayers.

If it be unlawful for schismatics to baptise, it must therefore be unlawful for you, for you originated the Schism.

If it be unlawful for sinners to baptise, we can prove from divine testimony that you are sinners also.

Finally, since the validity of Baptism does not depend upon the character of the man who has been chosen to baptise, but upon an act which lawfully is done but once, for this reason we do not set right[4] baptisms which have been administered by you,

[1] sc. *Baptismatis*. (Cf. v, 4: 'Apostolorum, quibus leges baptismatis dedit,' and 'certo tempore dedit leges baptismatis Filius Dei.')

[2] sc. the Oneness of Baptism.

[3] The crafty argument of the Donatists was this: 'There is only one Baptism, it is true, but the right to baptise is lost by the crime of *Traditio*'—and the Catholics were *Traditores*. Therefore Baptism administered by Catholics was no Baptism. It was 'unlawful,' null and void from the beginning.

[4] *emendamus*. Literally *correct*, sc. by rebaptising.

because both amongst us and amongst you the Sacrament is one.[1]

The whole nature of this Sacrament we shall set forth in our fifth book.

VI. The arguments set forth in Parmenian's treatise.

My brother Parmenian, you have indeed treated of many things, but I see that I must not answer you point by point, in the same order as that which you have employed. For you have written in the first place of the figures and praise of Baptism. Here (with the exception of your error concerning the Flesh of Christ) you have written well. But this, however, tells in our favour, as we shall show in its proper place.

Secondly, you have maintained that there is only One Church, from which heretics are shut out. You have, however, been unwilling to recognise where this One Church is to be found.

Thirdly, you have denounced the 'Betrayers' without fixing names or describing persons.

Fourthly, you have attacked the makers of Unity.[2]

Fifthly (to pass over matters of but trifling

[1] This is the enunciation of the true Catholic principle. Whether Peter baptises, or John, or James, or Judas Iscariot, it is truly Christ who baptises. (Cf. S. Aug. *Tract. vi in Joannem*: 'Nam si pro diversitate meritorum Baptisma sanctum est, quia diversa sunt merita, diversa erunt baptismata; et tanto quisque aliquid melius putatur accipere, quanto a meliore videtur accepisse.')

[2] *operarii Unitatis*. St. Optatus uses this phrase in very many places. Ziwsa says that it = *administri Unitatis* (officers or servants of Unity). I think, however, that it also carries with it the idea that these 'workmen' (Leontius, Macarius, Paulus, Taurinus and others of whom we shall hear so often in the course of this work—iii, 1, 3, etc.) achieved the task at which they laboured, no doubt, in an official capacity. *Operari est opus facere* (cf. note 3, p. 30). So I have translated it throughout simply *makers*.

importance), you have written about the Sacraments and Sacrifice of a sinner.

VII. The division of this work and the contents of its several books.

But it seems to me that in the first place the cities, positions, and names of the Betrayers and schismatics should be pointed out.[1] In this way the true authors of the crimes, concerning which you have written, may be convicted of their certain guilt.

Secondly,[2] I shall have to say which is the Church, or where is to be found the One Church—which is *the* Church—because, besides the One Church, there is no other.

Thirdly, I shall prove that we did not ask for the troops and that what is said to have been done by the makers of Unity does not concern us.

In the fourth place, I shall show who is the sinner whose sacrifice God repudiates, or from whose Sacraments [3] we must flee.

Fifthly, I shall treat of Baptism ; and in the sixth place of your ill-considered assumptions and mistakes.

VIII. The Flesh of Christ is not sinful.

But before I say anything of these subjects separately, I shall show briefly that you have spoken wrongfully [4] of the Flesh of Christ, for you have said that the Flesh which was drowned by the floods of

[1] The public records of each city, if searched, would show in which of these any persons had been guilty of the crime of *Traditio*, the names of the offenders, and whatever offices they might have held.

[2] St. Optatus thinks it well to deal first with the *quaestio facti*. Having done this (in Book I), he will come secondly (in Book II) to the *quaestio iuris*.

[3] *oleum*. (Cf. note 3, p. 11.)

[4] *male*.

the Jordan, and was thus cleansed from all stains, was the Flesh of Sin. You might have said this with reason if the Baptism of the Flesh of Christ had sufficed for all, so that it were not necessary for any man to be baptised for himself. Had this been so, the whole human family would have been in the Jordan, and all that which is born in the flesh would have been there. In that case there would have been no difference between the Faithful and any one of the heathen, for flesh belongs to them all; and since there is no man who is without flesh, if, according to your mode of expression, the Flesh of Christ was drowned in the waters of the Jordan, the flesh of all men would have gained this benefit. But the Flesh of Christ is one thing in Christ—quite another is the flesh of each man in himself. What came over you to call the Flesh of Christ sinful? Would that you had said 'the flesh of men in the Flesh of Christ.' But even thus, you would have spoken without reason,[1] since each believer is baptised in the Name of Christ, not in the Flesh of Christ, which belonged to Himself exclusively. I may add that His Flesh, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, could not be washed, amongst others, for the remission of sins, for It was without any sin.[2] You have gone on to say that It was drowned in the floods of the Jordan.[3] This word *drowned*, you have used inadvisedly enough, for it is a word which should be used only of Pharaoh and his people, who were so drowned by the weight

[1] *nec sic probabiliter dixeras.*

[2] *quae nullum videbatur admisisse peccatum* = quae nullum admittebat peccatum. This pleonastic use of *videor* is very common in Optatus.

[3] *addidisti et Iordanis diluvio demersam.*

of their offences, as to remain, like lead, beneath the waters. But the Flesh of Christ, when It went down into and came up from the Jordan, ought not to have been spoken of by you as drowned. His Flesh was found to be more holy than the very Jordan, so that rather did It cleanse the water by Its entrance, than Itself was cleansed.

IX. Mention of Heretics made by Parmenian to no good purpose.

Moreover, I cannot pass over a matter in which I think you have acted craftily. In order that you might lead the minds of your readers off the point, or deceive them, after you had described Circumcision and the Flood, and after you had praised Baptism, you thought fit to raise, as it were from the dead, heretics who were already dead and, together with their heresies, buried in oblivion—and this although not only their errors, but even their names, were unknown throughout Africa—Marcion, Praxeas, Sabellius, Valentinus, and the rest up to the Cataphrygae, all of whom were confuted in their time by Victorinus of Pettau,[1] by Zephyrinus of Rome,[2] by Tertullian of Carthage, and by other champions of the Catholic Church.[3] Why, then, do you wage a war with the dead, who have nothing to do with the affairs

[1] St. Jerome tells us that Victorinus, Bishop of Pettau, (who was martyred under Diocletian,) published many writings. His notes on the Apocalypse and a fragment on the Creation are extant.

[2] *urbico.* Cf. 'urbica commoratio' (ii, 4), 'in Urbe' (i, 27). Zephyrinus was Pope cir. 201–218.

[3] *et aliis adsertoribus Ecclesiae Catholicae.* It may, perhaps, at first sight seem somewhat strange that St. Optatus should mention Tertullian amongst 'the champions of the Catholic Church'; yet, before his apostasy to Montanism, no one ever defended the Catholic Faith with more zeal, energy and ability than the great Tertullian.

of our time? For no reason, excepting that you, who are a schismatic of to-day, having nothing that you can prove against Catholics, have been pleased to enumerate so many heretics and their heresies, to spin out your somewhat wordy treatise.

X. The distinction between heretics and schismatics.

Now there is another question: For what purpose have you mentioned those who have not the Sacraments which you and we alike possess?[1] Sound health does not clamour for medicine; strength which is secure in itself does not need outside help; truth has no lack of arguments; it is the mark of a sick man to seek remedies; it is the sign of a sluggard and a weakling to run in search of auxiliaries; it belongs to a liar to rake up arguments.[2]

[1] Mr. Sparrow Simpson, professing to paraphrase St. Optatus, writes as follows: 'Plainly these Donatists are schismatics. Although they are not in the Catholic Church, yet they are in possession of the same two Sacraments as the Catholics. They are not heretics. Heretics could not be in possession of true Sacraments, so Optatus teaches.' St. Optatus teaches (1) that Baptism in the Name of the Trinity is valid (v, 3); (2) that Baptism by heretics who falsified the Creed (and consequently the Baptismal Formula) is 'varium et falsum' (i, 12; cf. v, 13); (3) that certain heretics of this character, whom he specifies, 'have not the Sacraments,' also that they are 'separated from Catholic Sacraments' (i, 10); (4) that heretics in general are without 'Sacramenta legalia' (*id.*), and 'are strangers to the Sacraments of the Catholic Church' (i, 5). This exhausts the teaching of Optatus on this subject: Mr. Sparrow Simpson would himself call Nestorians and Eutychians heretics; he would say rightly that though they possess true Sacraments, they cannot use them lawfully: Mr. Sparrow Simpson allows himself to slip in the word *two* before *Sacraments*. St. Optatus nowhere writes of '*two*' or of '*the same two* Sacraments.' (*St. Augustine and the African Church Divisions*, by the Rev. W. S. Sparrow Simpson, B.D., p. 44.)

[2] If Parmenian had been in good faith, he would have confined himself to dealing with his living quarrel with Catholics. He was

To return to your book, you have said[1] that the Endowments[2] of the Church cannot be with heretics, and in this you have said rightly,[3] for we know that the churches of each of the heretics have no lawful Sacraments, since they are adulteresses, without the rights of honest wedlock,[4] and are rejected by Christ, who is the Bridegroom of One Church,[5] as strangers.[6] This He Himself makes clear in the Canticle of Canticles. When He praises *One*,[7] He condemns the others because, besides the One which is the true Catholic Church, the others amongst the heretics are thought to be churches, but are not such.[8] Thus He declares in the Canticle of Canticles (as we have already pointed out) that His Dove is One, and that

merely beating the air by arguing with dead heretics, none of whom were to be found at the time in Africa. All this was a virtual admission of the weakness of his cause, and a sign of intellectual dishonesty.

[1] *dixisti.*

[2] *Dotes.* Parmenian had maintained that there were six Notes or Endowments of the Church: *Cathedra*, *Angelus*, *Spiritus*, *Fons*, *Sigillum* and *Umbilicus*. St. Optatus recognises them all, except the last, and discourses on them in his second Book. (Cf. note 3, p. 64.)

[3] *et recte dixisti.*

[4] *scimus enim haereticorum ecclesias singulorum, prostitutas, nullis legalibus Sacramentis, et sine iure honesti matrimonii esse.* (Ziwsa has '*prostitutas*, i.q. *adulteras*.') The whole analogy is from valid marriage, in contrast with, and opposed to, an irregular union. Cf. iv, 8: 'de haereticis apud quos sunt sacramentorum falsa connubia'; iv, 6: 'haereticos dicit moechos et moechas Ecclesias illorum.' The True Church is the only Bride of Christ, who is 'the Bridegroom of One Church.'

[5] *qui est Sponsus Unius Ecclesiae.*

[6] *non necessarias.* Cf. iii, 1: 'Basilicas fecerunt *non necessarias*' (where see note 3, p. 121).

[7] Canticles vi, 8.

[8] *ceterae apud haereticos putantur esse sed non sunt.*

she is also[1] the chosen Spouse, and again[2] a garden enclosed, and a fountain sealed up.[3]

Therefore none of the heretics possess either the Keys, which Peter alone received,[4] or the Ring,[5] with which we read that the Fountain[6] has been sealed[7]; nor is any heretic one of those to whom that Garden

[1] *eandem.*

[2] *eandem* (so PGb) *hortum conclusum.* RBv read here *eundem.* This reading is—as I venture to think somewhat strangely—followed by Ziwsa. Du Pin has *eandem* and omits any reference to the variant.

[3] Canticles iv, 12.

[4] *Ut haeretici omnes neque claves habeant, quas solus Petrus accepit.* These are no doubt Parmenian's own words, a quotation from his book. They depend not upon what immediately precedes them, but upon *dixisti . . . et recte dixisti*, and are in the text adopted and endorsed by St. Optatus. This is made clear in i, 12: 'Bene revocasti claves ad Petrum.' It is hardly necessary to say that Peter received the Keys in the name of the Church.

[5] This is exceedingly obscure, and means of illustrating it from other writings of the Fathers are so scanty as to be practically non-existent. What is meant by the *Ring*? Albaspinaeus understands it of Absolution, and quotes a passage, which he claims to be relevant, from Tertullian (*De Pudicitia*). Casaubon will not have this at all. He understands it, though with hesitation, of the Ring with which, at certain fixed periods of the year, the baptisteries were sealed. Du Pin understands it either of baptism, for which he also quotes from Tertullian (*De Poenitentia*), or of the Creed. For the last interpretation Optatus himself may perhaps be quoted. He writes (ii, 8): 'Sigillum integrum (*id est Symbolum Catholicum*) non habentes ad fontem verum aperire non possunt,' and (i, 12): 'Bene subdixisti anulum iis, quibus aperire non licet ad fontem.' If, as is at least highly probable, *anulus* = *sigillum*, this settles the question. (Cf. Aug. *in Ioan.* lxxx, 2: 'Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum.' The Baptismal Formula is as it were the compendium of the Creed.)

[6] Du Pin understands the *Fountain* to be the Catholic Faith. More probably, however, it signifies the Baptismal Font, where that Faith was professed. (Cf. Note 3, p. 64, and Note 1, p. 84.)

[7] The reference is to Canticles iv, 12: 'My spouse is a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed up.' We search, however, in vain for any reference to the Mystic Ring, with which it is said by Optatus that 'we read that the Fountain has been sealed.'

belongs in which God plants His young trees.[1] Concerning these men, that which you have written at length (although it has nothing to do with our present business) is abundantly sufficient.

But to my surprise you have thought good to attach yourselves to those who certainly are schismatics, for in denying the Endowments of the Church both to those who are heretics, and also to schismatics, you have denied them to yourselves.

Amongst other things you have said that schismatics have been cut off, like branches, from the Vine, and that they have been reserved, marked off for punishment, like dried wood, for the fires of Hell.

But I see that you do not yet know that the Schism at Carthage was begun by your fathers. Search out the beginning of these affairs, and you will find that in associating heretics with schismatics, you have pronounced judgement against yourselves.

For it was not Caecilian[2] who went forth from Majorinus, your father's father,[3] but it was Majorinus who deserted Caecilian; nor was it Caecilian who separated himself from the Chair of Peter,[4] or from

[1] *arbusculas* (cf. i, 12; ii, 11).

[2] *Caecilian* was the Catholic Bishop of Carthage, whose consecration—as we shall soon see—was the occasion of the beginning of the Schism.

[3] *avo tuo.* The line of the first Donatist Bishops of Carthage was Majorinus, Donatus, Parmenian.

[4] *Cathedra Petri.* The manner in which St. Optatus goes first to the See of Peter and only in the second place to the local See of Carthage, in order to prove that the Donatists were in schism, is a fact of the greatest significance. It is quite clear that, in the eyes of Optatus, any bishop out of communion with the See of Rome was *ipso facto* schismatic. Otherwise, the reference to the Chair of Peter in this connection is utterly meaningless and unintelligible.

the Chair of Cyprian[1]—but Majorinus,[2] on whose Chair you sit—a Chair which had no existence[3] before Majorinus himself. Since then there can be no possible doubt that these things have thus happened, and that you are the heirs of Betrayers and schismatics, I am, my brother Parmenian, sufficiently surprised—seeing that you are yourself a schismatic—that you should have thought it advisable to join schismatics to heretics.

If, however, these are your principles, and you wish to do so, heap up together[4] what you have laid down only a little before. For you have said that 'It could not be that one who was stained should wash away sins in a baptism-that-is-not-Baptism,[5] that one who is unclean should cleanse, that one who trips men up[6] should raise them, that one who is lost should free,

Moreover, it is evident that Optatus expects the Donatists immediately to recognise the force of this argument. Without hesitation he appeals to them as follows: *Cum haec ita gesta esse manifestissime constet.* Now the facts which are here stated to be 'most clearly certain' are that Caecilian did not desert either the Apostolic See of Peter or the local See of Cyprian, and that consequently Majorinus, his rival, though consecrated by an influential party to the See of Carthage, 'began with himself.' Parmenian would no doubt have angrily denied that Majorinus was out of communion with the See of Cyprian; he could not possibly deny that Majorinus was out of communion with the See of Peter. This, in the eyes of Optatus, was decisive.

[1] *In Cathedra Petri vel Cypriani.* Cf. ii, 4: 'In Cathedra Petri quam nescio si vel oculis novit [Macrobius].' For the distinction between the Chair of Peter and that of Cyprian, cf. Augustine (II. *De Baptismo cont. Donat.* i, 2): 'Et si distat *Cathedrarum* gratia, una est tamen Martyrum gloria [Petri et Cypriani].'

[2] Majorinus was the first Donatist bishop. He was, however, merely a figurehead, whose personality was lost very early in that of his successor, Donatus the Great, the immediate predecessor of Parmenian.

[3] *originem.* [4] *cumula illa.* RBv read *cum illa.*
[5] *in falso baptismate.* G omits *in.* [6] *subplantator.*

that one who is guilty should give pardon, that one who has been condemned should absolve.'[1]

All these things might well be true of heretics alone, since they have falsified the creed,[2] for amongst them one has said that there are two Gods,[3] though God is One; another wishes the Father to be recognised in the Person of the Son[4]; another robs the Son of God of His Flesh,[5] through which the world has been reconciled to God, and there are yet others of the same kind, who admittedly are separated from Catholic Sacraments.[6] Wherefore you should regret that you have coupled schismatics with such men as these, for, when you thought that you were attacking others, you failed to observe how wide is the gulf between schismatics and heretics, and turned the sword of judgement upon yourself.

[1] Cf. i, 12; ii, 20.

[2] *quia falsaverunt Symbolum.* G reads *qui* for *quia.* Heretics who falsified the Creed would also falsify the Baptismal formula. Consequently, Baptism conferred by them would be invalid, since they did not baptise in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. (Cf. note 1, p. 17.) Mr. Sparrow Simpson writes (op. cit. p. 44): 'Heresy is surrender of the Creed,' and in a footnote gives '*qui falsaverunt Symbolum.*' Heresy, according to Optatus, is something worse even than 'surrender.' It is 'falsification,' the substitution of false teaching for true. And so has it ever been with heretics in every age. Luther, for example, was not content with 'surrendering' the doctrines of the supreme authority of the Church in the interpretation of Holy Scripture, and of salvation through 'Faith working by Charity.' He 'falsified' them, substituting the doctrines of 'Private Judgement,' and of 'Justification by Faith only.'

[3] This was said by Marcion (cf. iv, 5; v, 3)—also by Cerdon.

[4] With confusion of Personality (cf. iv, 5, note on Praxeas, note 2, p. 190).

[5] Valentinus (cf. iv, 5; 8) and the other Docetae.

[6] *a Sacramentis Catholicis alieni esse noscuntur.* Cf. note 4, p. 10, and note 1, p. 17.

This is the reason that you do not see which is the Holy Church,[1] and have in this way made confusion of everything.[2]

XI. The marks of the Catholic Church, and of Schism.

Catholicism is constituted by a simple and true understanding in the law,[3] by an unique and most true mystery,[4] and by unity of minds. But schism, after the bond of peace has been broken, is brought into existence through passion, is nourished by hatred, is strengthened by envy and dissensions, so that the Catholic Mother is abandoned, whilst her unfilial children go forth outside and separate themselves (as you have done) from the root of Mother Church—cut off by the shears of their hatred—and wickedly depart in rebellion. They are not able, however, to do anything new, or different[5] from that which long ago they learned from their Mother.

[1] *quae sit Sancta Ecclesia.*

[2] *sic omnia miscuisti.*

[3] *Catholicam facit simplex et verus intellectus in lege.* Harnack quotes this passage and understands by *lege* the two Testaments (*History of Dogma*, vol. v, p. 43), but states elsewhere that the word *lex* is used more than 100 years before the time of Optatus, of the Apostolic tradition preserved by the Roman Church, and *Lex Catholica* is a common expression in the documents placed by St. Optatus in his Appendix, so that the meaning of *lege* in this passage is not quite certain. Also it is doubtful whether *in lege* is the true reading here. PG have it, but Bvb give *intelligere*, R has *intellegere*. Ziwsa deserts P and prints *intellegere* ( = ' a true and simple understanding points out ' etc.). Casaubon is inclined to reject *intelligere*. He evidently had not seen *in lege*. Du Pin, though he had not the advantage of seeing P, has the merit (I think) of printing *in lege*. He boldly relied on G.

[4] *singulare ac verissimum sacramentum.* Du Pin explains ' sacramentum symboli,' and Albaspinaeus ' unum symbolum, una Fidei regula.'

[5] *novum aliquid aut aliud*, i.e. as long as they remain schismatics only—until they become heretics also.

XII. To return to the difference between heretics and schismatics.

But heretics, exiles from the truth, deserters of the sound and most true Creed,[1] corrupted by their wicked opinions and led astray from the bosom of Holy Church, reckoning nothing of their noble birth, in order to deceive the ignorant and ill-informed, have been pleased to be born of themselves. And they, who for a long time had been nourished on living food—which not assimilated has turned to corruption[2]—have by impious disputations vomited forth deadly poisons, to the destruction of their wretched dupes.

You see, then, my brother Parmenian, that none but heretics only—who are cut off from the home of truth—possess 'various kinds of false Baptisms with which he, who is stained, cannot wash, nor the unclean cleanse, nor the destroyer raise, nor he, who is lost, free, nor the guilty man give pardon, nor the condemned man absolve.'[3]

Rightly hast thou closed the Garden to heretics; rightly hast thou claimed the Keys for Peter[4]; rightly hast thou denied the right of cultivating the young trees to those who are certainly shut out[5] from the

[1] *sani et verissimi Symboli desertores.* Optatus here terms heretics *symboli desertores*; later on (iii, 8) he will term schismatics *caritatis desertores.* For *sani* cf. *vestis sana* (iii, 9); *lex in Deo sana fuit* (vii, 1).

[2] *corruptela malae digestionis.*

[3] This is a quotation from Parmenian's own words in his book. (Cf. pp. 21, 22.)

[4] Perhaps Parmenian held the view enunciated by Tertullian (*De Pud.* xxi, 9), after he had fallen into heresy, that the keys had been given to Peter *only*, not to the Church. Perhaps he held that they had passed from Peter to the Donatist Church. The Donatists, it will be remembered, had their Antipope.

[5] *alienos.* St. Optatus here says that heretics are *alieni ab hortulo et a Paradiso Dei*; later (ii, 6) he uses the same word (*alienum*), in the same sense, of schismatics.

garden and from the paradise of God[1]; rightly hast thou withdrawn the Ring from those to whom it is not allowed to open the Fountain. But to you schismatics, although you are not in the Catholic Church,[2] these things[3] cannot be denied, since you have shared true Sacraments with us.[4]

Wherefore, since all these things are justly denied to heretics, why did you think well to deny them to yourselves as well, who clearly are schismatics, for you have gone outside? For our part we were willing that in this matter heretics alone should be condemned, but so far as lies with you, you have chosen to strike yourselves, together with them, in one condemnation.[5]

XIII. The originators of the Donatist schism were Betrayers.

But now (to return to the order upon which we have determined), in the first place listen to the names of those who were Betrayers and learn more distinctly who were the originators of the schism. It is certain that two evil things have been perpetrated in Africa—even the worst of all[6]—the first—Betrayal, the second—Schism. Both these crimes were committed, in one period of time, by the same wicked men.

[1] *i.e.* the Church. Cf. (ii, 11) *ecclesiam paradisum esse dixisti, in quo horto Deus plantat arbusculas.* We see that St. Optatus when writing *hortulo et paradiso* is joining them as synonyms (cf. note 3, p. 8).

[2] *quamvis in Catholica non sitis.*

[3] The Ring (= the Creed) and the Fountain (= the Font). Cf. note 6, p. 19.

[4] *quia nobiscum vera et communia Sacramenta traxistis.*

[5] *quantum in te est, etiam vos ipsos una sententia ferire voluisti.*

[6] *duo mala et pessima.* Cf. 'Scisma summum malum' (i, 21) and 'Aestimo vos non negare unitatem summum bonum esse' (iii, 4).

You ought, therefore, my brother Parmenian, to learn that of which you are understood to be ignorant; for sixty years and more have passed since the storm of persecution spread abroad throughout the whole of Africa[1]—a persecution which made some Martyrs, others Confessors, whilst not a few it laid low in a terrible death,[2] leaving unharmed those who lay in hiding.

Why should I make mention of laymen who at that time were supported by no ecclesiastical dignity? Why name a host of clerics[3]? Or deacons in the third,[4] or priests in the second degree of the *sacerdotium*, when the heads and chiefs of all,[5] some Bishops of that

[1] Optatus refers here to the persecution under Diocletian, which began in the month of February A.D. 303, and ended in the West in 305.

[2] *prostravit in mortem funestam.* Sc. the death of the soul through apostasy.

[3] *ministros.*

[4] The application of the term *sacerdotium* to deacons cannot, I think, be found anywhere in antiquity excepting in this passage. Not many years after the death of St. Optatus, the Fathers at the Council of Carthage made the following distinction: 'When a deacon is ordained, it is the Bishop alone (without the imposition of hands of other priests) who blesses him, placing his hand upon his head, because he is consecrated, not to the *sacerdotium*, but to the ministry of service (*ministerium*).' The word *sacerdos* was used of either bishops or priests, *episcopus* being reserved for the first degree, and *presbyter* for the second degree, of the sacred ministry. It is very curious to read these words in the Canon Law (*Dist.* 31 Can. 14) 'Aliter se Orientalium traditio habet Ecclesiarum, aliter huius Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae. Nam illarum sacerdotes diaconi et subdiaconi matrimonio copulantur. Istius autem Ecclesiae vel Occidentalium nullus sacerdotum a subdiacono usque ad episcopum licentiam habet coniugium sortiendi.' As far as I can discover, this is the only instance of the word *sacerdos* being applied to subdeacons.

[5] *ipsi apices et principes omnium.* (P omits *omnium.*) The Episcopate is the *apex* of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. From the

period,[1] in order to purchase for themselves, at the loss of Life Eternal, some very short prolongation of this uncertain day, impiously betrayed the records [2] of the law of God? Amongst whom were Donatus of Mascula, Victor of Rusicca, Merinus from the Baths of Tibilis, Donatus of Calama, and Purpurius of Limata, the murderer [3]—who, when he was questioned on the charge of having killed his sister's sons in the prison of Mileum,[4] confessed it with the words: 'Yes, I did kill them, and not them alone do I kill, but whoever shall act against me.' And Menalius who pretended that he had a pain in his eyes, and trembled at the idea of meeting his own people,[5] for fear lest it should be proved against him by his fellow-citizens that he had offered incense to idols.

XIV. The acts of the Council of Cirta.

After the persecution, these Bishops and others whom we shall soon show to have been the first leaders of your schism, gathered together on the thirteenth of

point of view of the Sacrament of Order, the Bishop of Beneventum is the equal of the Bishop of Rome.

[1] *aliqui Episcopi illius temporis.* RBvb read *illis temporibus.*

[2] *instrumenta.* This word is used by Tertullian and others for a codex containing several books. Thus *Instrumentum Ioannis* = a collection of St. John's Epistles. *Novum Instrumentum* = the New Testament.

[3] *homicida.*

[4] *Mileum,* also called *Milevis,* the town where St. Optatus was Bishop.

[5] *ad consessum suorum procedere trepidavit.* Cf. 'consessum vitant' (i, 4). *Suorum* may mean his Brother Bishops, in which case *consessum* should be here translated a *Synod.* RBGv read *consensum,* but this is manifestly a mistake; it is corrected in the margin of G.

May [1] at the town of Cirta [2]—in the house of Urbanus Carisius—for the Basilicas had not yet been restored. This is attested by the writings of Nundinarius,[3] then a deacon, and is proved by the age of the parchments, which I can show to anyone really in doubt, for in the Appendix to these books I have subjoined the whole number [4] of these documents to certify the truth of my statements. These Bishops, on being questioned by Secundus of Tigisis, acknowledged that they had been Betrayers.[5] And, as Secundus [6] himself was taunted by Purpurius not for having escaped, but for having been set free after he had remained for a long time amongst the soldiers, they all stood up [7]

[1] *die iii Iduum Maiarum.* St. Augustine tells us that the official Acts of the Council of Cirta had *iv Nonas Martii.* Du Pin proves that the true date was *iii Nonas Martii.* The year was A.D. 305. These Bishops met to choose and consecrate a successor to Paulus, who had behaved so badly during the persecution under Diocletian two years previously (cf. Appendix, p. 353). Apparently Paulus had died in the interval (cf. S. Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii, 27–30).

[2] At this period the three chief governmental divisions of Africa were (1) 'The Proconsular' or Africa proper, with Carthage for its capital, (2) Numidia, (3) Mauritania. Cirta, soon to be refounded under the name of Constantine, which it still retains, was the capital of Numidia. The ecclesiastical division into provinces was roughly, but not exactly, coincident with the secular.

[3] For many references to Nundinarius, see Appendix, *Gesta apud Zenophilum*, pp. 347-381. Cf. Aug. *con. Crescon.* iii, 20; *Brev. Coll.* iii, 17.

[4] *Harum plenitudinem rerum.* The full evidence. Half of this appendix has unfortunately been lost. (Cf. Preface to Appendix, p. 322.) For Acts of Council of Cirta see Appendix, pp. 416–419.

[5] See Appendix, p. 417.

[6] Secundus was Primate of Numidia and President of the Council of Cirta.

[7] *iam omnes erecti caeperant murmurare.* RBvb have *heretici.* Casaubon, who had not seen *erecti*, points out that *heretici* is *contra mentem Optati* and suggests: '*haeret ei,*' *caeperant murmurare* ='they began to mutter "It sticks to him"'—i.e. It fits him. It

and began to mutter that he had been set free only because he betrayed the sacred books. Then Secundus, fearing their temper, received advice from his brother's son, Secundus the Less, to remit an affair of this character to God.[1] The others, who had not been accused, that is to say, Victor of Garba, Felix of Rotarium and Nabor of Centurio, were then consulted. They said that a case of this kind ought to be reserved to the Lord. Then said Secundus 'Sit down all.' They all replied 'Thanks be to God,' and sat down. You see, therefore, my brother Parmenian, that it is quite clear who were the Betrayers.

XV. The schism took its rise from the consecration of Majorinus.

It was not long after this, that these very persons whom I have mentioned, of the character I have described, Betrayers, men who had offered incense to idols, and murderers,[2] proceeded to Carthage, and there, although Caecilian was already the Bishop, made the Schism by consecrating Majorinus—on whose Chair, Parmenian, you sit. And since I have shown, that men who were guilty of Betrayal were your first fathers, it follows that Betrayers were also the originators of your Schism.

belongs to him—the charge is true.' This emendation is an example of Casaubon's extraordinary ingenuity. But *erecti* (PG) is certainly the true reading and would no doubt have been at once accepted by Casaubon (had he known of it) on its own merits, independently of the authority given it by P. So reluctantly we have to sacrifice '*haeret ei*.' Du Pin naturally takes *erecti* from G and observes of *heretici* 'criticos torsit.' But none of the critics, in his 'torture,' thought of *erecti*.

[1] *ut talem caussam Deo servaret.* This was the recognised expression when Bishops refused to give judgement, but remitted (or reserved) it to God.

[2] *homicidae.*

In order to make this matter clear and beyond doubt to all, we shall have to prove from what root the branches of error have stretched themselves forth to the present day, and from what fountain this your rivulet of noxious water,[1] creeping stealthily along, has flowed down even to our times. We shall have to point out whence, and where, and from whom this evil of schism has arisen; what were the causes which met together[2] to produce it; who were the persons who effected it[3]; who were the authors of this wicked thing; who fostered it; by whom appeal was made to the Emperor, that he should judge between the parties; who were they that sat in judgement; where the Council was held; what were its decrees.

The question is about a Division. Now in Africa, as in other parts of the world, the Church was One, before it was divided by those who consecrated Majorinus—whose Chair you have inherited, and now occupy.[4] We shall have to see who has remained in the root, with the whole world[5]; who went forth; who sits on a second chair, which had no existence before the Schism[6]; who has raised altar against altar; who has consecrated a Bishop when another was in undisturbed possession; who it is that lies under the judgement of John, the Apostle, when he declared that many Anti-Christs should go forth without,

'because they were not of us, for if they had been of us they would have remained with us.'[7]

[1] *rivulus iste maligni liquoris.* [2] *quae convenerint caussae.*
[3] *quae fuerint operatae personae.* (Cf. *operarii*, note 2, p. 13.)
[4] *cuius tu haereditariam cathedram sederis.*
[5] *cum toto orbe*, sc. Catholico. [6] Cf. S. Cyprian. *Ep.* xliii.
[7] 1 John ii, 19.

Therefore, he who was unwilling to remain with his brethren in unity[1] has followed the heretics, and gone forth without, as an Anti-Christ.

XVI. The quarrel of Lucilla against Caecilian.

No one is unaware that the Schism, after the consecration of Caecilian, was effected at Carthage through a certain mischief-making woman named Lucilla. When the Church was still in tranquillity, before her Peace had been disturbed by the storms of persecution, this woman could not put up with the rebuke which she received from the archdeacon Caecilian. It was said that she kissed a bone of some martyr or other—if he was a martyr—before she received the spiritual Food and Drink. Having then been corrected for thus touching—before she touched the Sacred Chalice—the bone of a dead man (if he was a martyr, at least he had not yet been acknowledged as such[2]), she went away in confusion, full of wrath. This was the woman upon whom, whilst she was angry and afraid that she might fall under the discipline of the Church, on a sudden, the storm of persecution broke.

XVII. Mensurius when summoned to the court entrusted the ornaments of the Church to certain seniors.

It was at this time also that a deacon called Felix who had been summoned before the tribunals on account of a much spoken-of letter which he had

[1] *in uno* (cf. John).

[2] *necdum vindicati.* Catholics in Africa were strictly forbidden to honour with religious worship any martyrs who had not been recognised as such (*id est* canonised = *vindicati*). There were some, who in a fit of fanatical enthusiasm had surrendered voluntarily to the persecutors, thus bringing death upon themselves. Those who had been guilty of this practice, which the Church never tolerated, far from being considered martyrs, were looked upon by Catholics as disobedient and self-destroyers.

written concerning the usurping Emperor,[1] fearing his danger, is said to have lain hidden in the house of Bishop Mensurius. When Mensurius publicly refused to give him up, an account of the matter was despatched. A rescript came back that unless Mensurius would surrender the deacon Felix, he should be himself sent to the palace.[2] On receiving this summons [3] he found himself in no small difficulty, for the Church possessed very many gold and silver ornaments, which he could neither hide under ground, nor take away with him. So he confided them to the care of some of the seniors, whom he believed to be worthy of trust, not, however, before he had made an inventory, which he is said to have given to a certain old woman. He charged her, that, when peace was restored to Christians, she should hand this over, if he himself did not return home, to whomsoever she found sitting on the Bishop's Chair. He went away and pleaded his cause; he was commanded to return, but was not able to reach Carthage.[4]

XVIII. The Consecration of Caecilian as Bishop of Carthage. The cause and the beginning of the Schism.

The storm of persecution passed over, and subsided. By the disposition of God, Maxentius sent pardon, and liberty was restored to Christians. Botrus and Celestius—so it is said—wishing to be consecrated Bishops at Carthage, arranged that, without inviting [5]

[1] *de tyranno imperatore*. These events took place in 311, when Maxentius, who had made himself Emperor in Italy in 306, had obtained possession of Africa. Under Constantine he was regularly referred to as *tyrannus*.

[2] *ad palatium dirigeretur*. *Dirigere* in late Latin = to send.

[3] *conventus*.

[4] He died on the way.

[5] *operam dederunt ut absentibus Numidis*. Literally 'in the

the Numidians, only the neighbouring bishops should be asked to perform the ceremony at Carthage.[1] Then, by the vote of the whole people, Caecilian was chosen, and was consecrated Bishop, Felix of Autumna laying his hand upon him. Botrus and Celestius were disappointed of their hope. The inventory of the gold and silver, as had been ordered by Mensurius, was handed over, in the presence of witnesses, to Caecilian, who was now in possession of the See. The above-mentioned seniors were summoned; but they had swallowed up in the jaws of their avarice, as booty, that which had been entrusted to their keeping. When they were commanded to make restitution, they withdrew from communion with Caecilian. The ambitious intriguers, who had failed to obtain their consecration, did likewise. Lucilla, too, that influential, mischief-making woman,[2] who had before been unwilling to brook discipline, together with all her retainers, separated herself from her Bishop. Thus wickedness produced its effect through the meeting together[3] of three different causes and sets of persons.

absence of the Numidians.' But the point is that Botrus and Celestius chose not to invite them. This was part of what they 'arranged' (*operam dederunt*).

[1] The Bishop of Carthage was not only Metropolitan of the province of Africa Proconsularis, but also Primate of all Africa, including Numidia, Byzacium and the two Mauritanias. As the confines of Numidia came close to Carthage, it was customary for the Bishops of that province to come to Carthage for the election. The other provinces were too far off. On this occasion only the nearest Bishops of Africa Proconsularis were assembled. But the vote of the clergy and people of Carthage, approved by a number of Bishops of the province, sufficed. The absence of the Numidians did not affect the validity of the election.

[2] *potens et factiosa femina.*

[3] *tribus convenientibus.* Cf. 'quae convenerint caussae' i, 15.)

XIX. The unlawful consecration by Numidian bishops of Majorinus against Caecilian.

In this way it came to pass, that at that time the Schism was brought to birth by the anger of a disgraced woman, was fed by ambition, and received its strength from avarice.[1]

It was by these three that the accusations were concocted against Caecilian, so that his Consecration might be declared void. They sent to Secundus of Tigisis[2] to come to Carthage, whither the Betrayers, of whom we have already made mention, proceeded. They received hospitality—not from Catholics, at whose request Caecilian had been consecrated[3]—but

[1] *Scisma igitur illo tempore confusae mulieris iracundia peperit, ambitus nutrivit, avaritia roboravit.* Here we find in combination the lust of the flesh—(the shameless woman)—the pride of life—(worldly ambition)—the lust of the eyes—(the love of gold)—as the three co-operating causes of the Donatist Schism. Before the mind of an English reader another sad schism will come with extraordinary vividness. History has repeated itself indeed—has shown how the anger of another shameless woman (also *potens et factiosa femina*, also in the end *confusa*), co-operating with the ambition of worldly ecclesiastics, together with the lust of the eyes and the lust of gold of a monarch, destroyed that 'parting gift of Peace' from Christ our Lord, which had reigned amongst all English Christians for more than a thousand years, and produced a Division, over which we grieve to-day. If Optatus might, without breach of charity, recall the memory of Lucilla, Majorinus, Botrus and Celestius, we too may, in like manner, without reproach, remember Anne, Cranmer, Henry and Elizabeth.

St. Augustine tells us (*Ep.* clxii) that a woman like Lucilla was subsequently the cause of a schism within a schism—of a later schism amongst the Donatists themselves.

[2] Because he was Primate of Numidia. In the African Provinces (excepting Proconsular Africa) the senior Bishop was Primate, whatever his See.

[3] St. Optatus does not mention the fact that Secundus had seventy Bishops in his Council. But St. Augustine (*Ep.* xliii, 3, 7) points out how hasty was Secundus: 'He should have had all the more fear of violating the peace of unity, on account of the greatness and fame of Carthage. If an evil started there, it would pour

from the avaricious, from the ambitious, from those who had been unable to govern their tempers. Not one of them went to the Basilica, where all the people of Carthage had assembled with Caecilian.[1]

Then Caecilian demanded:

'If there is anything to be proved against me, let the accuser come out and prove it.'

Nothing could at that time be got up against him by all these enemies of his; they imagined, however, that he might be blackened by his Consecrator being falsely alleged to have been a Betrayer. So Caecilian gave a second demand—that, since—so they thought—Felix had bestowed nothing upon him, they should themselves ordain him, as if he were still a deacon.[2]

itself over the whole of Africa, since it was near Italy, and of great celebrity. For this very reason its Bishop had a very great position (*non mediocris utique auctoritatis*), nor need he pay attention to the numbers of enemies who conspired against him, when he saw himself in union, by letters of communion, both with the Roman Church, in which the princedom of the Apostolic Chair has always flourished (*in qua semper Apostolicae Cathedrae viguit principatus*)—and with the rest of the world—whence the Gospel came to Africa, and where he was ready to plead his cause, should his adversaries attempt to alienate those churches from him.' We may observe that here we see once again the two proofs of a position of ecclesiastical security, quite distinct, but actually inseparable, firstly to be in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome, secondly to be in communion with all other Catholic Bishops throughout the world.

[1] *ad Basilicam, ubi cum Caeciliano tota civica frequentia fuerat.*

[2] *tanquam adhuc diaconum.* Caecilian here argued after this fashion: If you look upon me as still a deacon, on the ground of my ordination as priest and consecration as Bishop having been void, in consequence of Felix being a Betrayer, come and ordain me yourselves. You ought to do this, on your own principles, since you cannot deny that I was duly elected to the See. Needless to say, this was a challenge thrown out in sarcasm, which would never under any circumstances have been acted upon by Caecilian, even though it had been accepted by his adversaries. But of this

Then Purpurius, relying upon his usual ribaldry, thus spoke, as though Caecilian had been his sister's son [1]:

'Let him stand forth as if he were to be consecrated Bishop, and let his head be well smacked in Penance.' [2]

When the bearing of all this was seen, the whole Church [of Carthage] retained Caecilian, in order not to hand itself over to murderers.[3]

The alternatives were, either that he should be expelled from his See as guilty, or that the Faithful should communicate with him as innocent.

The church was crowded with people; Caecilian was sitting in his episcopal Chair; the altar was set up in its own place [4]—that very altar upon which

he knew that there was no danger. Yet then was their opportunity, if they really had possessed any arguments against the validity of the election of Caecilian to the See of Carthage. But they could only take refuge in scurrility and insult.

[1] Cf. 'Qui interrogatus de filiis sororis suae, quod eos necasse diceretur' (i, 13).

[2] *quassetur illi caput de Poenitentia.* According to the ancient discipline of the Church hands were laid upon the heads of those who were admitted to Penance, but it was strictly forbidden to lay hands thus upon the clergy, who had received the imposition of hands in Ordination (cf. ii, 24 and Augustine *Ep.* l). So now the ribald Bishop is represented as saying: 'Let him come, we will lay hands on him. We will box his ears for him.'

[3] *latronibus. Latro* in Optatus seems always to signify a murderer. (Cf. ii, 19; ii, 21; iii, 5; iii, 10 *Latronem aut furem*; v, 10, also Tertullian, *De Pudicitia*: 'Omne latrocinium extra silvam homicidium est.')

[4] *erat altare loco suo.* (*Altare*, sc. *Episcopi.*) African altars appear to have been in the fourth century in general wooden and moveable (for patterns see Dom Cabrol's *Dictionnaire Archéologique*, and Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*). 'In its own place'—i.e. in the Cathedral where the Catholic people had been accustomed for generations to see their Bishop say Mass. Optatus gives three visible signs, recognised by all the Faithful, showing that Caecilian was the acknowledged Bishop of Carthage. He was in possession of (*a*) the Cathedral Church (*Basilica*), (*b*) the

Bishops acknowledged by all [1] had in past times offered sacrifice—Cyprian, Carpophorius,[2] Lucian and the rest.

In this manner they went forth,[3] and altar was raised against altar; and there was an unlawful consecration; and Majorinus, who had been lector when Caecilian was archdeacon [4]—Majorinus, a member of the household of Lucilla—at her instigation, and through her bribes—was consecrated Bishop by Betrayers, who in the Numidian Council had (as we have already said) acknowledged their crimes and granted pardon to one another. It is, therefore, clear that both the Betrayers who consecrated, and Majorinus who was consecrated, went forth from the Church.[5]

XX. The letter of the Numidian Bishops against Felix, the consecrator of Caecilian.

Meanwhile, out of the fountain of their own crimes, which had gushed forth amongst them in channels [6] of many kinds of wickedness, they thought that a single one—that of Betrayal—might be spared [7] with which to calumniate the consecrator of Caecilian. For, since, as they foresaw, slander would not be able to occupy herself at the same time with two charges of a similar

Episcopal *Chair* (*Cathedra episcopalis*), (*c*) the *Altar* of his predecessors in the See.

[1] *pacifici*. Bishops when Unity (*Pax*) prevailed. Cf. vii, 5: 'dum docerent pacem, adhuc *pacifici* vocabantur . . . dividendo Ecclesiam noluerunt esse *pacifici*.'

[2] *Carpophorius*. This name is found only in PG.

[3] *Sic exitum est foras*. In this way Majorinus and his party went forth from the Church.

[4] *qui lector in diaconio Caeciliani fuerat*.

[5] *exisse de Ecclesia*.

[6] *multorum flagitiorum venis*. Cf. 'ne male fecundae vena periret aquae.' (Ov. *Trist.*)

[7] *de fonte . . . unum traditionis convicium derivandum esse*.

nature, they endeavoured to blacken the life of another man, that by this means they might consign their own crimes to silence. And, through fear that they should themselves be convicted by the innocent, they strove to convict the innocent instead. To this end they distributed on all sides a letter,[1] inspired by their hatred.[2] (This letter we have placed, together with the other Acts, in the Appendix.[3])

As they were still at Carthage, they sent their letters before them,[4] that by untruthful reports they might plant their falsehood in the ears of all. Rumour spread the lie broadcast amongst the people. Thus, whilst these calumnies were noised abroad about one man only, their own most certain crimes were hidden away in silence.

It often comes to pass that sin is blushed for, but at that period there was no one for whom to blush, since, with the exception of a few Catholics, all had sinned,[5] so the wickedness which had been committed by many wore the cloak of innocence. The shame of Betrayal, which admittedly had been committed by Donatus of Mascula and the others whom we have mentioned, seemed but of small account. To this Betrayal they added the enormous wickedness of schism.[6]

XXI. How grave is the evil of Schism, of which the Donatists are guilty.

Therefore, my brother Parmenian, you see these two accusations—so evil, so terrible—of Betrayal and

[1] *litteras.*
[2] *livore.* RB have *liliore,* Cochlaeus conjectures *suo ore.*
[3] This letter has been lost (cf. Appendix, p. 322).
[4] *praecesserunt se epistulis suis.*
[5] *peccaverant,* sc. had been guilty of Betrayal.
[6] *ingens flagitium scismatis.*

Schism proved against your chiefs. Acknowledge, though late, that you, in attacking others, have fallen upon your own people. And whilst it is certain that those who went before you worked this second abomination, you too strive to follow them in their sin-stained footsteps, so that you also have been doing for long, and are even now doing, that of which your Fathers were guilty in the beginning of the Schism.[1] They in their day broke peace; you now banish unity.[2] It can be said with reason of your Fathers as well as of yourselves, that, if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch.[3] A raging malice blinded your Fathers' eyes; envy has robbed yours of sight. Even you will not by any means be able to deny that schism is the supreme evil.[4]

Yet, without fear, you have imitated Dathan, Abiram and Korah, your shameless teachers,[5] and you have been unwilling to keep before your eyes the fact that God has both forbidden this wickedness, and gravely punished it when it has been committed. Moreover, remember that the way in which sins are either forgiven or punished shows that there are degrees of guilt.

Now, by the Commandments of God, three things are, amongst others, forbidden by Him. Thou shalt

[1] *in titulo scismatis.*

[2] *exterminatis unitatem.* This expression is repeated in vii, 5.

[3] Matt. xv, 4; Luke vii, 39.

[4] *scisma summum malum esse et vos negare minime poteritis* (cf. i, 13). St. Augustine writes (*con. Ep. Parmen.* i, 4): 'sacrilegium scismatis *quod omnia scelera supergreditur*'; and (*id.* ii, 8): 'Quod autem vos a totius orbis communione separatos videmus —quod scelus et *maximum* et manifestum est.' (Cf. note 4, p. 40.)

[5] *perditos magistros vestros. Perditos* = abandoned, lost to all sense of shame. Cf. 'perditorum multitudinem' (vi, 1).

not kill; thou shalt not go after[1] strange gods, and summing up the commands,[2] thou shalt not commit schism.

Let us see concerning these three, what should be punished, and what it may be lawful to pardon.

Murder of kith is the chief sin.[3] Nevertheless, God did not strike Cain dead in his guilt, but declared that He would punish any man who might be his murderer. In the city of Nineve one hundred and twenty thousand inhabitants sacrilegiously followed after strange gods, but when, by the preaching of Jonah the prophet, God had declared His anger, a short period of fasting, together with prayer, obtained their pardon. Let us see whether any such forgiveness was granted to those who first of all ventured to divide the people of God.[4]

God had placed over so many thousands of children of Israel, from whose necks His Divine Providence had cast away the yoke of servitude, one Priest, holy Aaron. But his ministers, coveting and lawlessly usurping a priesthood to which they had no right, and

[1] *non ibis post.*

[2] *in capitibus mandatorum.* Cf. Romans xiii, 9, where all the sins against our neighbour are summed up as sins against the command to love one's neighbour as oneself. Schism is pre-eminently a sin against the neighbour from whom the schismatic separates himself.

[3] *parricidium est principale delictum.*

[4] Cf. S. Aug. (*De Baptis. con. Donat.* i, 8): 'Itaque illi quos baptizant sanant a vulnere idololatriae, gravius feriunt vulnere scismatis. Idololatras enim in populo Dei gladius interemit, scismaticos autem terrae hiatus absorbuit.' No one can say that the Fathers of the Church underestimated the guilt of schism! It must always be borne in mind that, according to the constant teaching of the Fathers, sin in the Christian, a member of the Body of Christ, is before God far more heinous than sin in the unbaptised. (See St. Thomas, 1, 2, qu. cvi, art. 2 ad. 2; 2, 2, qu. x, art. 3 ad. 3.)

leading astray a part of the people, imitated the sacred rites, and placed more than two hundred of their followers (who were to perish with them)—censers in their hands—before the people whom they had led astray. God, to whom schism is displeasing, could not see this and let it pass ; they had, after a certain fashion, declared war against God, as if there were a second God,[1] who would accept a second sacrifice. Therefore God was wrathful with a mighty wrath, on account of the schism which had been made, and what He had not done in punishment of the sacrilegious and the fratricide,[2] that He did do in punishment of schismatics. The army of ministers stood in array, and the sacrilegious host that (together with its forbidden sacrifices) was to perish in an instant. The opportunity for penance was denied them and withdrawn, for this was not the kind of sin that should deserve pardon. The earth was commanded to hunger after its food. Forthwith it opened its jaws for those who had divided the people, and with eager mouth swallowed them up that had despised the commandments of God. Within the space of one moment the earth opened to devour them, seized her victims, was shut once again, and, so that they might not appear to reap any benefit from the suddenness of their death, it was not allowed these men who were unworthy to live even to die. Of a sudden they were shut in the prison of Hell, and were buried there before they died.

And yet you wonder that something of similar severity has been done against you—you who either cause or approve schism, although you see here what

[1] Cf. iii, 11 ; v, 3. [2] *in parricidam.*

they, who compassed the first schism, deserved to suffer! Or is it because punishment of this kind has now ceased, that on this account you claim innocence for yourself and for your party? In each of these occurrences, God has set forth a model by examples [1] of the punishment that will come to their imitators. The first sins He has put an end to with punishment, as an example for all time. The sins that come after He will reserve for His Judgement. What have you to say to this, you, who having usurped the name of the Church, both secretly foster and without shame defend the schism?

XXII. The Letter of the Donatist Bishops to the Emperor Constantine, in which they ask for judges of their case.

I hear that some of your party, in their love of disputation, produce documents. But we have to ask which of these are worthy of trust, which are in accordance with reason, which agree with the truth [2]? It may be that your documents—if indeed you have any—will be found to be stained with falsehoods. Our documents are proved to be true by the rival arguments and pleadings of the parties, by the final judgements, and by the letters of Constantine.

With regard to that which you ask of us:

'What have Christians to do with kings, or Bishops with the palace?'

If it be a crime [3] to be acquainted with kings, the whole of the odium falls upon you, for your

[1] *exemplorum posuit formam.*

[2] *confibulent.* RBG have *confabulent,* vb *confabulentur.* Casaubon conjectures *confibulentur. Confibulare* is a Low Latin word for *to buckle to* (from *Fibula*)—literally here, 'buckle on to the truth.'

[3] *si nota est.*

fathers Lucianus, Dignus, Nasutius, Capito, Fidentius and the rest, when the Emperor Constantine was still without any knowledge of these affairs, addressed a petition to him, of which I will transcribe a copy [1] :

'O Constantine, most excellent Emperor, since thou dost come of a just stock, and thy father (unlike other Emperors) did not persecute Christians,[2] and Gaul is free from this wickedness, we beseech thee that thy piety may command that we be granted judges from Gaul ; for between us and other Bishops in Africa disputes have arisen ; Given by Lucianus, Dignus, Nasutius, Capito, Fidentius and the rest of the Bishops who adhere to Donatus.' [3]

[1] *precibus rogaverunt, quarum exemplum infrascriptum est.* Cf. S. Aug. *Ep.* lii, 5 ; lxxvi, 2.

[2] Constantine Chlorus had the command of Gaul as Caesar, and, being almost a Christian, did not put the decrees of persecution in force.

[3] *et ceteris Episcopis partis Donati.* Mgr. Duchesne (*Le Dossier du Donatisme*, p. 25) (who takes for granted the existence of Donatus, Bishop of Black Huts, see note 3, p. 45) thinks that either these words did not belong to the original document and were added by Optatus as a résumé of the signatures, or that Optatus deliberately ('se soit cru permis d'y substituer') changed the word *Maiorini* to *Donati*, since by the time when Optatus wrote, *pars Donati* had become the usual and recognised designation of the Donatist party. Du Pin had already made the same suggestion ('ipse Optatus nomen notius substituit in locum antiqui'). But neither Du Pin nor Duchesne can have adverted to the fact that Optatus later on (iii, 3) founds an argument in two separate passages upon the use which he supposed the Donatist clerics to have made of the expression *partis Donati* in this petition. The difficulty concerning the employment of these words at this period is twofold. (1) The party could hardly have been yet termed *pars Donati.* We do not hear of any Donatus as in any sense their leader until the Synod under Miltiades. (2) We read in the *Gesta Coll. Carthag.* (*diei* iii, ccxxx) that two *libelli* were sent to Constantine, the first of which was endorsed '*Libellus Ecclesiae Catholicae* criminum Caeciliani traditus a *parte Maiorini*' (cf. also S. Aug. *Ep.* lxxxviii). For those who believe that Majorinus was dead and Donatus was Bishop of Carthage before the Synod under Miltiades commenced

XXIII. The answer of Constantine. He appointed Judges to meet at Rome.

After having read this letter, Constantine replied with much anger. And in his rescript he testified to the matter of their petition in the words:

'You ask a judgement from me in this world, although I myself am waiting for the Judgement of Christ in the next.'[1]

(see note 3, p. 45) the objection raised against the words *Partis Donati* would at once vanish, were it not for the second difficulty—the difficulty arising from the fact that the *Gesta Collationis Carthagiensis* and the testimony of St. Augustine prove beyond dispute that this document was presented *ex parte Maiorini*. 'Quinto loco haec acta sunt. Recitatae sunt duae relationes . . . una quae ostendit Maiores Donatistarum id est *de parte Maiorini*' (*Brev. coll. diei tert.* xii). Balduinus falls back on the ingenious hypothesis that the *first* document was endorsed *de parte Maiorini*, the *second de parte Donati*. But unfortunately for this view St. Augustine (*id.*) gives a brief summary of this second document, which shows that it was by no means identical with that set out by St. Optatus. After everything has been weighed, we can only suppose either that (as seems to me most probable) the copy (*exemplum*) seen by Optatus really contained the words *partis Donati*, or that he wrote from memory and through a slip (not unnatural under the circumstances of his time and place) wrote *Donati* when, if his memory had not played him tricks, or rather if he had scrutinised his original more carefully, he would have written *Maiorini*. We know that on several occasions he made similar slips when quoting from Holy Scripture.

Dom John Chapman writes as follows: (*Donatus the Great and Donatus of Casae Nigrae, Rev. Bénédictine*, Janvier 1909): 'The Bishops who appealed to Constantine were Lucian, Dignus, Nasutius, Capito, Fidentius and others. There is no Donatus and no Majorinus among the five whose names are preserved. St. Optatus calls them proleptically the *Pars Donati*, but the *Proconsul in his letter to the Emperor* called them the *Pars Maiorini* [see Appendix, p. 421]. As the name of Majorinus does not occur in the first place, he may have just died, and Donatus will have taken his place before the ten accusers started for Rome. The Council was in that case a trial of the two claimants Donatus and Caecilian. The one was acquitted, the other condemned, This is a natural sequence.'

[1] See Appendix, p. 396.

These words were written by Constantine after the Council of

Nevertheless, he granted them judges—Maternus from the city of Cologne, Reticius from the city of Autun, Marinus of Arles. These three Bishops from Gaul and fifteen others, who were Italians, arrived in Rome. They met in the House of Fausta on the Lateran, on the second of October which was a Friday, in the year when Constantine for the fourth, and Licinius for the third time, were Consuls.[1]

There were present Miltiades,[2] Bishop of the city of Rome, and Reticius, Maternus and Marinus, Bishops from Gaul, and Merocles of Milan, Florianus of Sinna, Zoticus of Quintianum, Stennius of Ariminum, Felix from Florence of the Tuscans, Gaudentius of Pisa, Constantius of Faenza, Proterius of Capua, Theophilus of Beneventum, Sabinus of Terracina, Secundus of Preneste, Felix of the Three Taverns, Maximus of Ostium, Evandrus of Ursinum and Donatianus of Criolo.

XXIV. The acquittal of Caecilian by the Roman Council.

When these nineteen Bishops had taken their seats together, the case of Donatus and that of Caecilian were brought forward. This judgement was passed against Donatus[3]—by each of the Bishops—that he

Arles. Optatus (who never mentions and probably knew nothing of that Council, cf. Appendix, p. 323) inserts them here in error.

[1] *Constantino quater et Licinio ter consulibus.* St. Augustine, however, writes (*post Coll.* xxxiii) : 'Melchiades iudicavit Constantino *ter* et Licinio *iterum* consulibus.'

[2] Often called Melchiades, Pope from 311 to 314.

[3] *in Donatum.* Was this Donatus the Great, or another Donatus, Bishop of Black Huts (*de Casis Nigris*) in Numidia ? It is impossible to answer this question with absolute certainty. On the one hand it was assumed by Optatus, Augustine and Catholic Apologists generally until the Conference in 411 that the Donatus condemned by Pope Miltiades was Donatus the Great, the successor

acknowledged having both rebaptised, and laid his hand in Penance upon Bishops who had fallen away—

of Majorinus as schismatic bishop of Carthage. The authority of St. Optatus—so at least it seems to me—should go far to settle the controversy, since it is difficult to understand how he could well have confused two distinct Bishops of the same name one with another. Optatus lived, one would think, too near the events which he was chronicling to have made a mistake of this character. On the other hand when the Donatists protested at the Conference of Carthage that the Donatus condemned at Rome was not their protagonist, 'he who was and still is their chief' (*Gesta Coll. Carthag. diei* iii, xxxii), but another Donatus ('alium Casae,' *Gesta Coll. Carthag.* dxxxix, dxl), the Catholics at once admitted that Donatus of Casa was clearly designated in the Acts of Miltiades. St. Augustine bears witness to this fact, stating that the Catholics granted (*concedebant*) the Donatist contention that 'it was not Donatus the Great but Donatus of Casa who pleaded in the Court of Melchiades against Caecilian' (*Brev. coll. diei* iii, xx). Moreover Augustine writes as follows (*Retract.* xxi): 'In saying that the Donatus whose letter I was answering had asked the Emperor to appoint judges from across the seas between him and Caecilian I was mistaken, for it was not he but another Donatus (who however belonged to the same schism) that will be found more probably to have done this. He was not the Donatist Bishop of Carthage, but of Black Huts, and was the first to make the wicked schism at Carthage.' Until recently this view reigned practically undisputed. Only Albaspinaeus was found to challenge the authority of St. Augustine by conjecturing that Majorinus, of whom we never hear in connection with the Lateran Synod, was dead at the time (this is held to be certain by Dom John Chapman) and that Donatus of Black Huts had been elected Bishop in his place. But the very existence of a Donatus who was ever Bishop of Black Huts has been lately called in question, in the first place by Fr. Chapman, and subsequently by others. Thus Mr. Sparrow Simpson writes (*St. Augustine and African Church Divisions*, p. 31), referring to Monceaux (*Revue de l'Histoire de Religion*): 'it has been recently pointed out that the former personage [Donatus of Black Huts] is a highly problematical figure. He appears at the Lateran Synod. While he is called Bishop of Black Huts in Numidia, he is never heard of as residing in his own diocese, but at Carthage. After the Lateran Synod he disappears and is replaced by a Donatus who holds precisely the same position over the party.' The theory of Albaspinaeus,

a thing foreign to the Church.[1] Donatus brought forth his witnesses; they admitted that they had nothing of which they could accuse Caecilian. Caecilian was pronounced innocent by the sentence of all the above-named Bishops; also by the sentence of Miltiades, by which the matter was closed, and judgement pronounced in these words[2]:

if adopted, would remove these difficulties, but it involves the supposition that there were two Bishops of Carthage, immediately following one another and each named Donatus. For this supposition there is not a scrap of evidence. Moreover such a translation from one See to another as is here supposed would have been directly opposed to the Canons in force at the time, and if it had been effected would certainly have been one of the staple charges against the Donatists. But of this there is not a trace in history. Fr. Chapman solves the whole difficulty with the simplicity of genius by a reasoned argument (*La Revue Bénédictine*, Janvier 1909) directed to show that Casae Nigrae was not the See, but the birthplace, of the Great Donatus. In the same article he suggests a most interesting explanation of the surprising readiness with which the Catholics at the Conference of Carthage admitted the Donatist contention that their eponymous champion had not been condemned at Rome. However after all has been said, the whole of this matter will remain at least for some minds hidden in obscurity, and it is difficult to see from what quarter we may look for further light. Meanwhile we must all agree with Fr. Chapman that 'the importation of a Bishop of Casae Nigrae only brings confusion into [what would otherwise be] a plain tale.' I myself think that, were Professor Ziwsa still alive, he would gladly bow to Fr. Chapman's authority and arguments and remove the name of Donatus Casensis (at least as a person distinct from Donatus Carthaginis) from the index to any subsequent edition of his Optatus.

[1] *quod ab Ecclesia alienum est.*

[2] *etiam Miltiadis sententia, qua iudicium clausum est his verbis.* These words of St. Optatus remind us of St. Augustine's famous statement (*Serm.* cxxxi, 10): 'Already two councils have been sent to the Apostolic See concerning this matter [Pelagianism], and thence have come rescripts. The case is concluded (caussa finita est). Would that the error might soon cease also.' St. Augustine's account of the matter with which St. Optatus is concerned in the text is well worth reading, since he (like St. Optatus) had documents

'Since it is certain that those who came with Donatus have failed to accuse Caecilian in accordance with their undertaking, and since it is also certain that Donatus has not proved him guilty on any count, I judge that, according to his deserts, he be maintained in the

which have not come down to us: 'Will you urge that Melchiades, Bishop of the Roman Church, with his colleagues across the seas was not right in arrogating for his own judgement (non debuit . . . sibi usurpare iudicium) a case which had been concluded by seventy African Bishops under the presidency of the primate of Tigisis? But what if it was not he who arrogated it? It was, in fact, because he had been requested, that the Emperor sent Bishops to sit with him, and to decide what they considered to be just with regard to the whole case. This we prove both by the petition of the Donatists and by the Emperor's own words; for you will remember that both these documents were read to you, and you have now permission to inspect them and copy them out' (*Ep.* xliii, 5, 14). (See Appendix for the Emperor's letters.) St. Augustine is not, of course, suggesting that the Pope had no right to judge the affair, any more than he is implying that the Emperor had a right to appoint judges. The argument is strictly *ad hominem*. The Donatists could not complain that Melchiades had no right to reverse the judgement of seventy Numidian Bishops, since they had themselves appealed to the Emperor to appoint Bishops to judge the matter anew. They admitted, therefore, that the Numidian judgement was not irreformable. Further on in the same letter St. Augustine continues: 'And yet what a final sentence that was which the blessed Melchiades himself pronounced, how innocent, how honest, how far-sighted and peace-loving, in that he did not venture to remove from their position in the episcopal fellowship those colleagues against whom nothing had been proved, whilst he laid the chief blame upon Donatus alone (whom he had discovered to be the author of all the evil), but gave the free option of recovering communion to the rest, since he was ready to issue letters of communion even to those who were known to have been ordained by Majorinus, in such wise that, wherever, on account of the dissension between the two parties, there were two rival Bishops, the one who had been first ordained should be confirmed in his see, and the other should be provided with another diocese. O admirable man, O son of Christian peace, and father of the Christian people' (*Ep.* xiii, 5. 16). We may observe that from this time forward the Popes issued their decretal letters from a small council of Bishops.

communion of the Church, continuing to hold his position unimpaired.'[1]

XXV. How Constantine received the appeal of Donatus from the Roman judgement.

It is, therefore, sufficient, that Donatus was condemned by the verdict of so many Bishops, and that Caecilian was cleared by the judgement of so great an authority.[2] Yet Donatus thought well to appeal. To this appeal the Emperor Constantine replied in these words:

'Oh, mad daring of their fury! A Bishop has thought fit to appeal to us, as is done in the lawsuits of the Pagans.'[3]

XXVI. What took place in Africa after the Roman Synod.

At the same time Donatus also asked that he might be allowed to return, and promised that he would not go to Carthage.[4] Then it was suggested to the Emperor

[1] Ziwsa remarks that it is not known from what source St. Optatus derived this summary of the judgement of Pope Melchiades.

[2] Of the Pope.

[3] Constantine wrote these words in answer to the appeal of the Donatists *after the Council of Arles*. They are to be found in the same document from which Optatus has already quoted in chapter xxiii (Appendix, p. 397).

[4] *petiit, ut ei reverti licuisset et nec ad Carthaginem accederet* (PG). Ziwsa, however, prints asterisks * * * between *licuisset* and *ad Carthaginem* and suggests that *Ad ea mandatum, ne* should be inserted after *licuisset*. RBv have *reverienti ad Carthaginem contingeret*, which cannot be translated. The version read at the Conference at Carthage in 411 was the same as that of PG without the *nec*. 'Donatus asked that he might return and go to Carthage.' It was this version which afforded the Donatists their opportunity of pretending that Constantine had given Donatus leave to go to Carthage and kept Caecilian at Brescia, but we shall see immediately that when Caecilian heard that Donatus had gone to Carthage, he left Brescia and went there himself. It is this fact that makes it probable either that the *nec* in PG was in the original text of Optatus, or that some such emendation as that of Ziwsa must be adopted.

by Filuminus his advocate,[1] that, for peace' sake, Caecilian should be detained at Brescia—and so it was done.[2] Then two Bishops were sent to Africa, Eunomius and Olimpius, to do away with the dual Bishops and establish a single one.[3] They came, and remained at Carthage forty days, that they might declare where was the Catholic Church.[4] The seditious party of Donatus could not endure this, and every day noisy uproars were made through party spirit.

Eventually these Bishops, Eunomius and Olimpius, delivered their final decree to the effect that the Catholic Church [5] was that which was dispersed all over

[1] *suffragatore.*

[2] Cf. S. Aug. *Brev. coll.* xx, 38.

[3] *ut remotis duobus unum ordinarent* RBvb. P has *ut remotis binis singulos ordinarent.* Du Pin has removed the sentence from his text, (as I think,) quite unwarrantably in the face of the MSS. authority.

[4] *ubi esset Catholica.*

[5] *ut dicerent illam esse Catholicam, quae esset in toto orbe terrarum diffusa.* This definition is really an etymological one; it became famous in the Donatist controversy, and is frequently cited and referred to by St. Augustine.

(*a*) ἡ καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία or *Ecclesia Catholica* almost always means, in the Fathers, the Church militant on earth at the time when they wrote. Thus even at the beginning of the second century the word Catholic is used by St. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Smyrn.* 8) for the true Church throughout the world, in contrast with heretical sects. It is also found four times in *The Letter of the Church of Smyrna on the Martyrdom of the holy Polycarp:* Τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας (*ad init.*); Τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας (viii, xix); Τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας.

(*b*) The word 'Church' is sometimes used in another sense to denote the Church on earth in all times and places, and the epithet Catholic is still strictly in place. For example, later in the second century St. Clement of Alexandria wrote as follows (*Strom.* VII, xvii, 106, 107):—'It needs no long discourse to prove that the merely human assemblies which they have instituted were later in time than the Catholic Church. . . . We say then that the ancient

the world, and that the Judgement of the nineteen

and Catholic Church stands alone . . . gathering together into the unity of the One Faith, built upon the fitting covenants or rather upon the one Covenant given at different times, all those who have been already therein enrolled' etc.

(*c*) The Church is also said to include not only her children on earth, but also the holy dead. Thus St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei* xx, 9): 'Neither are the souls of the holy dead separated from the Church, which even now is the Kingdom of Christ.' In this most comprehensive sense the epithet Catholic is rarely (if ever) applied to the word 'Church.' Should any case perchance exist where a Father so employs the word *Catholic*, it would be 'less properly' (as opposed to the general patristic usage)—in the sense that the Blessed souls in Heaven and in Purgatory belonged to the Catholic Church when they were living on earth. It seems well to note this, because there has sometimes been confusion on the point amongst Non-Catholic writers. For example Dr. Darwell Stone (*The Christian Church* p. 214) philosophises concerning 'two ideas of the unity of the Church which St. Augustine failed to reconcile,' and boldly writes as follows: 'that notion of the nature and unity of the Church which may be illustrated from Clement of Alexandria and from Origen, but also from St. Augustine, which lays stress on the union of the church militant with the departed and with those yet unborn, and which finds points of contact amongst living Christians in the unseen realities, is not really allowed for in the Roman Catholic doctrine.' Of course it is pure imagination to fancy that there were two opposing views in the minds of the Fathers, striving for the mastery, which 'Augustine failed to reconcile,' but which eventually emerged the one in 'Ultramontanism,' the other in some such system as Anglicanism. But there *are* two ways of looking at the Church, as we regard it from different aspects. We find both of these, as we should naturally expect, in the Fathers. There is the ordinary patristic view, with which St. Optatus for example makes us so familiar, of one Body upon earth, not merely local, but scattered throughout the world, with its members all joined together, one with each other, in an actual, visible, external communion. (This on Anglican theories is admittedly not a necessity, but only a desirable dream-picture.) There is also, no doubt, to be found in the Fathers a conception of the Church as an ideal unity of all the redeemed on earth and in heaven, united by the mystical indwelling of the Holy Spirit. But far from these being mutually exclusive views between which the Fathers oscillate, they are two different entities, each of which represents a great reality, not merely 'allowed for,' but much more—apprehended by 'the Roman

Bishops which had already been delivered could not be upset.[1] Accordingly they communicated with the

Catholic' as keenly now as in any age of the Church's history. The latter of these, however, is not what the Fathers mean by 'the Catholic Church,' but *is* the whole Church of the Redeemed—whose 'names are written in heaven'—now *in fieri*, only to be realised at the Last Day. The former is the Church militant, *the Catholic Church*, diffused throughout the world (as its name implies) *and nowhere else*. It is of this visible Catholic Church that the Fathers predicate unity, not merely as a quality, but as an essential quality, and a visible 'note' or characteristic by which (in conjunction with her existence everywhere, or her Catholicity) she is to be instantly recognised. This is the meaning of the definition of Eunomius and Olimpius (as given by St. Optatus), which cut at the root of the Donatist question. On the one side stood a great number of African bishops. On the other side was Caecilian with (probably) but few colleagues in Africa, but in communion with all the rest of the Catholic world. So seventy African Bishops, even with the Primate Secundus, were of no importance, for over against them was 'the Catholic Church.' It is exactly the same touchstone as St. Cyril of Jerusalem had given when he told his hearers to ask in every city not for the κυριακή (the house of God, or Church), but for 'the Catholic Church,'—the same touchstone that St. Pacian gave against the Novatians, when he said 'Christian is my name, Catholic is my surname.' *The visible unity of one visible Church throughout the world* is the presupposition and the teaching of all the Fathers. This is seen perhaps with special clearness in this Donatist controversy. But at all times and everywhere the patristic conception of the Church and of Schism is, apart from this presupposition, wholly unintelligible.

(*d*) There is yet another distinction made by St. Augustine against the Donatists between the Catholic Church on earth, in which good and evil men are living together, and the Church of the Saints after the General Judgement. It is, he writes, One Holy Church, but after a different fashion (*aliter*). The state of the Church *now* was typified by the miraculous draught of fishes before the Resurrection when the nets were cast on the left hand as well as on the right—and were broken; the state of the Church *hereafter* by the draught after the Resurrection, when the nets were cast only on the right side—and remained unbroken. (Cf. *Brev. Coll.* iii, 9, 10.)

[1] St. Augustine (*con. Epist. Parmen.* iii, 3) summed up the decision of Eunomius and Olimpius in the celebrated words: 'Quapropter securus iudicat orbis terrarum bonos non esse qui

clergy of Caecilian, and went their way. All this we can prove from the written Acts which any who please may read in our Appendix.[1] When these things had taken place, Donatus was the first to return to Carthage, unasked. Caecilian, on hearing this news, hastened back to his own people. In this way the schism was planted anew. But the fact remains that so many Bishops had by their Judgement condemned Donatus, and had also pronounced the innocence of Caecilian.

XXVII. The clearing of Felix, the Consecrator of Caecilian.

But since two persons on the Catholic side had been for some time accused in this matter—the consecrated and the Consecrator—even after the consecrated had been acquitted at Rome, it still remained for the Consecrator to be declared guiltless. Then Constantine wrote to Aelianus, the pro-consul, to lay

se dividunt ab orbe terrarum in quacunque parte orbis terrarum.' 'Wherefore the [Catholic] world judges without anxiety that they are not good who in any part of the world separate themselves from the [Catholic] world.' (Cf. note 6, p. 63.)

[1] These Acts have unfortunately been lost (cf. Appendix, p. 321). St. Augustine writes (*Brev. coll.* xii, 24): 'Atque inde ex ordine coepit etiam episcopale iudicium Melchiadis Romani Episcopi et aliorum cum illo Gallorum et Italorum Episcoporum in eadem Urbe Roma factum, cuius iudicii prima parte, id est gestis primae diei recitatis, ubi accusatores Caeciliani, qui missi fuerant, negaverunt se habere quod in eum dicerent; ubi etiam Donatus a Casis Nigris in praesenti convictus est, adhuc diacono Caeciliano [that is in the days of Mensurius, when Donatus the Great was probably, like Caecilian, still a deacon, and far more likely to cause trouble at Carthage than any Bishop of Casae Nigrae in Numidia] scisma fecisse Carthagine: de Carthaginis enim scismate exorta est adversus Ecclesiam pars Donati.' From this we learn that the Acts of the first session of the Lateran Synod were read at the Conference of 411, but here once more we have to deplore the loss of the full minutes of the latter part of the proceedings.

aside his public duties and make public inquiry into the life of Felix of Autumna.[1]

The appointed officer took his seat. The witnesses were Claudius Saturianus,[2] a state commissioner, who had been in the city of Felix all through the time of the persecution, and had been a commissioner when he was impeached, Callidius Gratianus and Alfius Caecilianus the magistrate; also Superius the Warder was summoned, and Ingentius the public notary, who was in constant fear of the torture with which he was threatened. By the evidence of all it was ascertained that there was nothing that could disgrace the life of Felix the Bishop.[3]

The Volume of Acts is in existence in which are recorded the names of those who had been present at the trial, Claudius Saturianus the official, and Caecilianus the Magistrate, and Superius the Warder, and Ingentius the Notary, and Solon a public official of the time. After they had given their replies, the above-mentioned pro-consul gave his Judgement, of which this is a part:

[1] See Appendix, p. 327. We know that Aelianus conducted the inquiry; we know also from St. Augustine (*Ep.* lxxxviii; *con. Cresc.* iii, 81) that Constantine wrote a letter to Probianus, the successor of Aelianus. But Duchesne writes (p. 12) that Aelianus in the text is probably a mistake for Aelius Paulinus, the Vicar of Africa, 'qui se mit en mouvement pour exécuter l'ordre impérial.'

[2] Called Saturninus by St. Augustine, *Ep.* lxxxviii. (Cf. p. 426, note 1.)

[3] *nihil tale inventum est, quod vitam Felicis Episcopi sordidare potuisset* P. For *sordidare* RBGv have *ordinare*, which evidently must be wrong. Accordingly Cochlaeus conjectured *deordinare*, and Du Pin *in vita Felicis Episcopi, propter quod ordinare non potuisset*. If Du Pin had seen P, he would never have hazarded this guess, of which he says: 'Nos restituimus hunc locum partim ex coniectura, partim ex auctoritate MSS,' and explains that all the MSS which he had been able to consult have *ordinare*.

'That Felix, the holy Bishop, is guiltless of having burned the divine Books,[1] is clear from the fact that no one was able to prove anything against him—neither that he had given up nor burned the most sacred Scriptures. For all the above-mentioned witnesses proved clearly that none of the divine Writings had been either discovered, or injured or burned. It is shown by the Acts that the holy Bishop Felix was not present at that time, and that he was neither privy to any such crime, nor commanded it to be done.'

And so he left the court, cleared of every stain upon his reputation and wonderfully praised. Up to that time men did not know what to think of him, and he had walked under a dark cloud, caused by the breath of hatred and jealousy, whilst truth lay hid. And besides, every document, mentioned either in the Acts or in the letters which we have mentioned or read, was disclosed.[2]

XXVIII. The end of this First Book.

You see, my brother Parmenian, that you have assaulted Catholics to no purpose—falsely nicknaming them Betrayers, changing the names of those who were concerned, and transferring their deeds. You have shut your eyes, that you might not recognise the guilt of your fathers; you have opened them to cast accusations upon the innocent and blameless.[3] You have stated everything according to what is opportune,

[1] *liberum esse ab exustione strumentorum deificorum.*

[2] *revelata.* B has *renovata.*

[3] *innocentes et indignos criminose pulsares* P (so Ziwsa). RBvb read *indignos crimini copulares* = 'to link with crime those who deserve it not.'

nothing according to what is true; so that it was of you that the most Blessed Apostle Paul said:

'Some have turned aside to vain-speaking, desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say nor of whom they say it.'[1]

We have just now proved that your fathers[2] were Betrayers and schismatics; yet you, who are their heir, have not wished to spare either schismatics or Betrayers, so that by the proofs which we have alleged, all the darts which you mistakenly wished to hurl against others have glanced back—warded off by the shield of truth—to strike your fathers. Everything, then, which you have been able to say against Betrayers and schismatics, belongs to yourselves, for we have nothing to do with any of it,—we who both remain in the Root, and are joined, with all, in the whole [Catholic][3] world.

[1] 1 Tim. i, 5, 6. [2] *parentes.*

[3] Cf. *illam esse Catholicam, quae esset in toto orbe terrarum diffusa* (i, 26).

## BOOK THE SECOND

WHICH IS THE ONE TRUE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND WHERE IS IT TO BE FOUND? THE FIVE ENDOWMENTS OF THE CHURCH BELONG TO CATHOLICISM, NOT TO THE SCHISM. THE DONATISTS HAVE BEEN GUILTY OF SHAMELESSLY SCRAPING THE HEADS OF PRIESTS, AND OF MURDERS, OF GIVING THE EUCHARIST TO DOGS, AND OF CASTING AWAY THE HOLY CHRISM.

I. Which and where is the Catholic Church? It is spread all over the world.

WE have shown who were the Betrayers, and have pointed out the origin of the Schism in such a manner that we have almost seen it take place before our eyes.[1] The difference between heresy and schism has also been explained. It is now our business to show (as we promised that we would do in the second place) which is the One Church, called by Christ His Dove and His Bride.[2]

The Church, then, is One, and her holiness is not measured by the pride of individuals,[3] but is derived

[1] *ut paene oculis perspecta videatur.* St. Augustine may have had these words before his mind, when he wrote of the martyrdom of St. Stephen: 'Hanc passionem modo de libro Actuum Apostolorum cum legitur, non solum audivimus sed etiam oculis spectavimus' (*Sermo* ii *de Sancto Stephano*).

[2] In the Canticle of Canticles.

[3] The Donatists, like the Cathari, the Puritans and many other sectaries, prided themselves (without the slightest justification in

from the Sacraments. It is for this reason that she alone is called by Christ His Dove and His own beloved Bride.

The Church cannot be amongst *all* the heretics and schismatics.[1] It follows that [according to you] she must be in one place only.[2]

You, my brother Parmenian, have said that she is with you alone. This, I suppose, can only be because, in your pride, you strive to claim some special holiness for yourselves, so that the Church may be where it pleases you, and may not be where it pleases you not. And so, in order that she may be with you in a little piece of Africa, in a corner of one small region, is she not to be with us in another part of Africa? Is she not to be in Spain, in Gaul, in Italy, where you are not? If you maintain that she is with you only, is she not to be in Pannonia, in Dacia, Moesia, Thrace, Achaia, Macedonia and in all Greece, where you are not? In order that you may be able to argue that

fact) upon their sanctity. According to their teaching, the true Church was to be exclusively the Church of 'the Saints.' There were to be no unclean beasts in the Ark of Noah. The tares were not to be allowed to grow up with the wheat unto the harvest; nor were the bad fish to remain with the good in Peter's net. Furthermore, they made the validity of the sacraments depend upon the supposed holiness of the minister, not upon the operation of the Holy Ghost.

[1] Evidently the idea of Comprehensiveness—that the One Church could be Catholic (Universal)—in the sense of comprehending various kinds of religious bodies, varying in belief and without any external bond of union (cf. ii, 3)—never occurred to St. Optatus even as a possibility. Any 'branch' theory in which the branches were separated from the trunk or from one another (cf. ii, 9 etc.) would have seemed to him unthinkable. He agrees with Parmenian in ruling it out *ab initio*.

[2] Because no heretics or schismatics were to be found as an organised body in more than one territory.

she is with you, is she not to be in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Pamphylia, Phrygia, Cilicia and in the three Syrias, and in the two Armenias, and in all Egypt and in Mesopotamia, where you are not? And is she not to be throughout innumerable islands and so many other provinces which can hardly be counted, where you are not? [1]

Where in that case will be the application of the Catholic Name,[2] since on this very account was the Church called Catholic, because she is in accordance with reason, and is scattered all over the world? [3]

[1] In some of the countries mentioned by Optatus as belonging to the Catholic Unity, Christianity has almost disappeared as an energising force. Others of those lands, such as 'Thrace, Achaia, Macedonia, and all Greece,' are now unhappily in schism. Still, his argument has been enormously strengthened by the lapse of centuries. The Catholic of to-day is in full communion not only, as was St. Optatus, with the See of Rome where Peter sat, with the See of Lyons where Irenæus sat, with the See of Barcelona where Pacian sat, with the See of Tours where Martin sat, with the See of Verona where Zeno sat, with the See of Milan where Ambrose was soon to sit, with the direct successors of 'Maternus from the city of Cologne, of Reticius from the city of Autun, of Marinus of Arles, of Felix from Florence of the Tuscans, of Gaudentius of Pisa, of Proterius of Capua,' and of every other of the nineteen Bishops who sat in the Synod of the Lateran with Miltiades the Pope (i, 23)—this is surely a great and striking thing—but also with Churches of which Optatus never dreamed, in islands and continents of which he had never heard.

[2] *ubi ergo erit proprietas Catholici Nominis?*

[3] *rationabilis et ubique diffusa.* Thus in all the MSS. Two emendations have been suggested, *Non nationalis et* &c., and *Rationabiliter ubique diffusa.* Probably, however, St. Optatus wrote it as we find it in the MSS., *Rationabilis et ubique diffusa.* If so, through his ignorance of Greek, he is linking together two different derivations of the word καθολικός. From κατά and ὅλον, = '*throughout the whole*' (i.e. scattered throughout the world), and from κατά and λόγον = 'in accordance with reason.' We know that, in consequence of this last meaning of the word, Procurators fiscal

For if you limit the Church just as it may please you, into a narrow corner, if you withdraw whole peoples from her communion, where will that be which the Son of God has merited, where will that be which the Father has freely granted Him, saying, in the second Psalm :

' I will give to Thee the nations for Thine inheritance ; and the ends of the earth for Thy possession ' ? [1]

To what purpose do you break so mighty a promise, so that the breadth of all the kingdoms is compressed by you into a sort of narrow prison ? Why do you strive to stand in the way of so great a largesse ? Why do you fight against the Saviour's Merits ? Permit the Son to possess that which has been granted to Him ; permit the Father to fulfil that which He has promised.

Why do you put bounds, why set limits ? There is nothing in any part of the earth which has been withheld from His dominion, since the whole earth has been promised by God the Father to the Saviour. The whole earth has been granted to Him together

in Roman law were often called *Rationales* or καθολικοί. St. Optatus was probably in his first derivation thinking of heretics, in his second of schismatics. The Church is Catholic or *rationabilis* (according to right reason) in contradistinction to *heretics*, who have strayed from the truth (against the due exercise of their reason) ; she is Catholic or *ubique diffusa* (spread everywhere) in contradistinction to schismatics, who are confined within clearly defined, very often within national, bounds and limits. Cf. St. Augustine, *Gesta Collationis Carthagiensis diei* iii, ci : ' Christiani Afri, et appellantur et merito sunt Catholici, ipsa sua communione nomen testantes. *Catholon* enim *secundum totum* dicitur. Qui autem a toto separatus est, *partemque defendit ab universo praecisam*, non sibi usurpet hoc nomen, sed nobiscum teneat veritatem.'

[1] Ps. ii, 8.

with its nations. The whole world is Christ's as His undivided possession.[1] God proves this when he says :

> ' I will give unto Thee the nations for Thine inheritance, and for Thy possession the bounds of the earth.' [2]

And in the seventy-first Psalm, it has been written of the Saviour Himself,

> ' He shall reign from sea to sea, and from the waters to the bounds of the world.' [3]

When the Father gives, He makes no exception ; you, that you may give Him one fraction, endeavour to take away the whole measure. And, still, you endeavour to persuade men that the Church is amongst you alone, taking away from Christ that which He has won—denying that God has performed His promises. What ingratitude ! What folly ! What presumption is yours ! Christ invites you, with all others, into the company of the Heavenly Kingdom and exhorts you to be co-heirs with Him ; and you strive to rob Him of the inheritance given Him by the Father, allowing Him a part of Africa and refusing Him the whole world, which the Father has bestowed upon Him.

Why do you desire to make the Holy Ghost appear a liar, who in the forty-ninth Psalm tells of the goodness of Almighty God, saying :

> ' The Lord, the God of Gods has spoken and has called the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof ' ? [4]

[1] *Christo una possessio est.*
[2] Ps. ii, 8.
[3] Ps. lxxi, 8.
[4] Ps. xlix, 1.

Therefore the earth has been called to become flesh.[1] And, as it has been written, so has it been done, and the earth owes praises to its Creator.

Once more this is mentioned, where the Holy Spirit exhorts us in the hundred and twelfth Psalm with the words :

'The Name of the Lord must be praised from the rising of the sun even to its going down.'[2]

And again, in the ninety-fifth Psalm :

'Sing ye to the Lord a new song.'[3]

If this were the only verse, you might say that the Holy Ghost had exhorted you alone. But that He might show that this has been said not to you alone, but to the Church which is everywhere, He continued :

'Sing to the Lord, all the earth ; declare amongst the nations His glory, His wonderful works amongst all peoples.'[4]

He said :

'Declare amongst the nations.'[5]

He did not say, 'in a small part of Africa, where you are' ; He did say 'Declare amongst all peoples.'[6]

He who said 'all peoples' excepted no man. Yet

[1] *Vocata est ergo terra ut caro fieret.* Cf. 'I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh and will give you a heart of flesh' (Ez. xxxvi, 26).

[2] Ps. cxii, 3.

[3] Ps. xcv, 1.

[4] Ps. xcv, 1–3: 'Cantate Domino omnis terra, pronuntiate in gentibus gloriam Ipsius, in omnibus populis mirabilia Eius.'

[5] '*pronuntiate,*' *inquit,* '*inter gentes.*'

[6] '*pronuntiate,*' *inquit,* '*in omnibus populis.*'

you are proud to be alone and separated from 'all peoples,' though to them this command was given; and you maintain that you, who are not *in any part of the whole*,[1] are yet yourselves alone the whole.

He has said:

'The name of the Lord must be praised,' and 'by all the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof.'[2]

Can then the Pagans, who are outside the covenant of Christ,[3] either sing to God or praise the name of the Lord? Is it not His Church alone, which is within the covenant,[4] that may praise Him?[5] Therefore, if you say that the Church is with you only, you are defrauding God's ear of its due. If you alone are praising Him, 'the whole world,'[6] which is from the

[1] *qui in omni toto non estis.* This remains to-day the great Catholic argument against the pretensions of the 'Orthodox' Easterns. It is as effectual now as when St. Optatus first wrote the words. Like the Donatists before them, the 'Orthodox' are not 'in any part of the whole' (they are not in that Church, which is visibly Catholic—spread throughout the world); yet, like the Donatists again, the 'Orthodox' claim to be the whole. But St. Optatus teaches that only those constitute 'the whole,' who are visibly united 'in the whole,' that is who are 'everywhere' (*ubique*).

[2] Ps. cxii, 3.

[3] *Pagani extralegales.*

[4] *sola Ecclesia, quae in lege est,* as opposed to the 'Pagani extralegales,' of whom he has just written. *Lex,* as so often elsewhere in Optatus, means 'Lex Christi,' 'Lex Catholica' (cf. v, 5 etc.).

[5] St. Optatus gives us no hint of the great teaching about the Soul (or Heart) of the Church, which is clearly expressed by St. Augustine.

[6] *Totus orbis.* By this phrase St. Optatus and St. Augustine always mean the whole *Catholic* world. Cf. the saying of St. Augustine: 'Securus iudicat orbis terrarum' (see note 1, p. 52)—by which he means, of course, not the world separated from the Catholic Church—even less the non-Christian world—but the Catholic world. The

rising of the sun to its going down, will be keeping silence. You have shut the mouths of all the Christian nations. You have imposed silence on all the peoples who desire to praise God from moment to moment. If then God waits for the praise which is His due, and if the Holy Spirit exhorts men to sound His praises,[1] if 'the whole world' is prepared to render to God His due, lest God be robbed—then should you also praise Him, together with all, or, (since you have refused to be with all,) in your isolation, hold your tongues.

II. He proves from the Cathedra Petri that the *Cathedra* which is the first endowment of the Church belongs to Catholics, not to Donatists.

So we have proved that the Catholic Church is the Church which is spread throughout the world.

We must now mention its Adornments,[2] and see where are its five Endowments (which you have said to be six[3]), amongst which the CATHEDRA is the first;

Catholic world is the Judge, and judges free from anxiety, for this very reason that it *is*, and knows itself to be, the Catholic world.

[1] *ut sonent.* Cf. vii, 1: 'per loca singula divinum sonat ubique praeconium.'

[2] St. Optatus has given us a summary proof that the Catholic Church is not merely local, but claims to be everywhere. He proceeds, in answer to Parmenian, to discuss the Adornments (*Ornamenta*) or Endowments (*Dotes*) of the Church. The figure is that of a Dowry bestowed by our Lord upon His Bride, the Church. There is no other reference to these *Dotes* in patristic literature.

[3] It is not difficult to reconstruct Parmenian's argument from the pages of Optatus. We see that Parmenian had argued that the Endowments were six in number, and had maintained that they were all distinctive of Donatism and lacking to the Catholic Church.

(1) *Cathedra* (the expression for See so well known in Africa from the writings of St. Cyprian).
(2) *Angelus* (from Apoc. ii, 3).
(3) *Spiritus.*
(4) *Fons signatus* (from Cant. iv, 1).
(5) *Sigillum* (quo fons signatur).
(6) *Umbilicus* (from Cant. vii, 2).

It was common ground between Optatus and his opponent that the

and, since the second Endowment, which is the '*Angelus*,' cannot be added unless a Bishop has sat on

*hortus conclusus* (enclosed garden) of Cant. iv, 12–13 ('Hortus conclusus mea sponsa, hortus conclusus, fons signatus, emissiones tuae paradisus') signified the Church (cf. ii, 11: 'Quod *ore tuo et sensu nostro* ecclesiam paradisum esse dixisti'). Accordingly the *fons signatus* (sealed fountain) is the *baptismal font*, which (according to Parmenian) is sealed to all outside the true Church, so that Baptism by schismatics as well as by heretics is invalid. The *sigillum* (seal) is the baptismal creed.

The font is only made a saving fountain, if it is blessed by the true Bishop or *angelus*. Only thus is the third Endowment, the *Spirit*, in the water of Baptism. Parmenian proves this by quoting John v, 4, whence St. Optatus' words (ii, 6): 'Unde vobis angelum, qui apud vos possit fontem movere aut inter ceteras dotes Ecclesiae numerari?' We see that Parmenian had evidently taken the 'Angel' in the Apocalypse (without identifying him with any particular Bishop) in order to prove that only a true Bishop was able so 'to move the water,' that the Spirit should be there for valid Baptism. By *Umbilicus* Parmenian understood the altar. We can thus follow what no doubt was his argument. 'The true Church has,' he will have said to the Catholics, 'six Endowments.' (1) *Cathedra*, a lawful right to the See. But Caecilian had no such right, for the Numidian Bishops were not called to his election, and a Council of seventy Bishops deposed him. (2) *Angelus*, or a Bishop sent by God, but Caecilian was ordained by a *Traditor*. (3) *Spiritus*, the Spirit of adoption, who makes sons of God in Baptism. (4) This Spirit will only work by means of the water in the *Fons*, which is moved by the *Angelus*. Hence all those persons who have been baptised by others than Donatists must be rebaptised. (5) For the Fountain is *signatus sigillo* (Symboli), and all but Donatists are heretical. (6) And the *Umbilicus* (altar) must also belong to the true *Angelus*. On this pretext they scraped, broke down and even utterly destroyed Catholic altars (cf. vi, 1). Such is the argument that St. Optatus had to meet. He denied (on what seems to us to be a technicality only) that *Umbilicus* was one of these Endowments, but proceeded (2–9) to argue against Parmenian that the first five belonged to Catholics, and were marks of the Catholic Church exclusively, and in no way shared by the Donatists. In the first place, he takes *Cathedra* and *Angelus* together, and shows that the Donatists could have neither the one nor the other unless they were in union with the See of Peter. For the *Cathedra Petri* pre-eminently is *the* Cathedra.

the *Cathedra*,[1] we must see who was the first to sit on the *Cathedra*, and where [2] he sat. If you do not know this, learn. If you do know, blush. Ignorance cannot be attributed to you—it follows that you know.[3] For one who knows, to err is sin. Those who do not know may sometimes be pardoned.[4]

You cannot then deny that you *do* know [5] that upon Peter first [6] in the City of Rome [7] was bestowed the Episcopal *Cathedra*,[8] on which sat Peter, the Head of all the Apostles (for which reason he was called Cephas[9]),

[1] St. Cyprian was the first Father to use the term *Cathedra* (Chair). He applied it (as a word in common use at the time) to the See of Rome which he termed the *Cathedra Petri*. Parmenian, evidently, had claimed the *Cathedra*, stating that it belonged to him through the *Angelus* or Bishop (in other words 'We have valid Orders, and therefore we are in the Church'). St. Optatus replies to this in the text by making direct appeal to Rome. No man can possess a *Cathedra*, argues Optatus, who is not in communion with the one *Cathedra*, which, in all but successive sentences, he calls 'una Cathedra,' 'singularis Cathedra' and 'Cathedra unica.' Balduinus, in the course of a long letter which he addressed to Calvin on the occasion of bringing out his first edition of Optatus, remarked as follows: 'Locutus est, ut scis, Christus de iis, qui sedent in Cathedra Mosis; veteres Christiani de iis, qui in Petri.'

[2] *quis et ubi prior Cathedram sederit?*

[3] Cf. vii, 5 (p. 294).

[4] This is what we are now accustomed to call 'Invincible Ignorance' (cf. John ix, 40).

[5] Evidently St. Optatus had no fear that any objection should be taken to what he was about to urge, as to something new. On the contrary, it was well known and recognised by all. '*You cannot deny that you do know.*'

[6] *Petro primo.* This in answer to who it was who first sat on the Cathedra (*quis?*). The answer is *Peter*.

[7] *in urbe Roma.* This in answer to the question *where* was he the first to sit (*ubi?*). The answer is *Rome*.

[8] *Cathedram episcopalem esse conlatam.*

[9] Evidently this is an instance of *paronomasia* or play upon words (Cephas from κεφαλή). It is so atrocious etymologically to derive an Aramaic from a Greek word that Balduinus thinks that

that, in this one *Cathedra*, unity should be preserved by all,[1] lest the other Apostles might claim—each for himself—separate *Cathedras*, so that he who should set up a second *Cathedra* against the unique *Cathedra* [2] would already be a schismatic and a sinner.

*Unde et Cephas appellatus est* was not written by St. Optatus, but was introduced by some librarian from a marginal note of an ignorant commentator. But we must remember that neither Optatus nor any of the ancients knew anything of etymology. In vii, 3, St. Optatus simply calls St. Peter *Caput Apostolorum*, without any further comment.

[1] *in qua unica Cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur.* This is the doctrine so often and so clearly expressed by St. Cyprian, cf. e.g. 'Una ecclesia a Christo Domino nostro super Petrum, origine unitatis et ratione fundata' (*Ep.* lxx, 3), and 'Petro primum Dominus, super quem aedificavit Ecclesiam, et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit' (*Ep.* lxxiii, 3), and 'Deus unus est et Christus unus, et una Ecclesia, et *Cathedra una*, super Petrum Domini voce fundata' (xliii, 5). We should always bear in mind that St. Cyprian was at this time the great authority in Christian Africa, not only in the eyes of Catholics, but also in those of Donatists. Thus St. Augustine writes (*Brev. Coll.* iii, 10): 'Repetierunt Catholici testimonium Cypriani . . . Contra quod testimonium omnino nihil ausi fuerunt respondere, cum auctoritatem Cypriani tanti habeant, ut per illam conentur defendere, quod male de iterando Baptismo sentiunt et faciunt.'

[2] *ne ceteri Apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent, ut iam scismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem Cathedram alteram conlocaret.* This perfectly plain doctrine of St. Optatus was never once challenged amongst Christians (the Albigenses were Manichees rather than Christians) until the days of Hus and Wycliffe, some nine hundred years later. We know that the work of St. Optatus was the great authority and handbook of St. Augustine in his arguments against the Donatists. He constantly echoes the teaching of St. Optatus, concerning the Chair of Peter, and, in his controversy with the Donatists, applied the famous promise 'Upon this Rock I will build my Church' to this Holy See. 'Sedes Petri . . . ipsa est Petra' (*Ps. con. Donat.* St. xiv). Dr. Sparrow Simpson, however, writes as follows with reference to this passage of St. Optatus: 'Optatus illustrates this succession from the case of Rome, because St. Peter as the chief

Well then, on the one *Cathedra*, which is the first of the Endowments, Peter was the first to sit.[1]

III. The Succession of Bishops of Rome.

To Peter succeeded Linus, to Linus succeeded Clement, to Clement Anacletus, to Anacletus Evaristus, to Evaristus [2] Sixtus, to Sixtus Telesphorus, to Telesphorus Hyginus, to Hyginus Anacetus, to Anacetus Pius, to Pius Soter, to Soter Alexander, to Alexander Victor, to Victor Zephyrinus, to Zephyrinus Calixtus, to Calixtus Urban, to Urban Pontianus, to Pontianus Anterus, to Anterus Fabian, to Fabian Cornelius, to Cornelius Lucius, to Lucius Stephen, to Stephen Sixtus, to Sixtus Dionysius, to Dionysius Felix, to Felix Marcellinus, to Marcellinus Eusebius, to Eusebius Miltiades, to Miltiades Silvester, to Silvester Marcus,

Apostle, represents the principle of unity. No Apostle was to arrogate to himself the Apostolic powers *in separation from the other Apostles'* (*St. Augustine and African Church Divisions*, Chapter on St. Optatus' Reply to the Donatists, p. 45). Unfortunately for Dr. Sparrow Simpson's accuracy, St. Optatus has not (either here or elsewhere) written one syllable about 'no Apostle' separating from 'the other Apostles.' He has, however, explained (vii, 3) that the Apostles were not free, on account of Peter's denial of Christ, to separate from the one Apostle 'who alone received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, to be shared with the rest.' He has also written with all possible emphasis concerning the unlawfulness of separating from the *Cathedra Petri*, which he here calls 'the unique Cathedra.' Of all this, we regret to say that Dr. Sparrow Simpson gives not even a hint in his in some respects useful analysis of the argument of Optatus.

[1] Cf. St. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Antonian.* i, 8: 'cum Fabiani [Romani Episcopi] locus, id est cum locus Petri et gradus Cathedrae sacerdotalis vacaret.'

[2] St. Augustine copied this list of Popes given by St. Optatus. Yet it is incomplete and in one case inaccurate. The name Alexander should come after Evaristus, Eutychian and Gaius should come after Felix, Marcellus (probably) after Marcellinus, and where Optatus places Alexander (after Soter), he should have placed Eleutherius. It may also be mentioned that in the list given by Irenæus (*Adv. Haer.* iii, 3) Pius precedes Anacetus.

to Marcus Julius, to Julius Liberius, to Liberius Damasus, to Damasus Siricius,[1] who to-day is our colleague, with whom 'the whole world,'[2] through the intercourse of letters of peace,[3] agrees with us in one bond of communion.[4]

Now do you show the origin of your *Cathedra*,[5] you who wish to claim the Holy Church for yourselves!

IV. The Donatist Bishops and their meeting-houses in Rome.

But[6] you allege that you too have some sort of a party in the City of Rome.[7]

[1] In the first edition of St. Optatus written about 370 A.D. the list of Popes ended with Damasus. The name of Siricius who became Pope in 383 was added in the second edition (cf. Preface to Book VII).

[2] *Totus orbis* (cf. note 1, p. 52).

[3] *Commercio formatarum.* As is well known, the Catholic world in the early centuries was kept in touch with its various parts through the communication of *litterae formatae*, or 'letters of peace,' which passed at stated times between the Bishop of Rome and all Catholic Bishops, and were also often sent from these Bishops to one another. (Cf. Aug. *Ep.* xliv, 3; *con. Cresc.* iii, 34.) *Formatae* = τετυπωμέναι. τυποῦν = *sigillare.* (Cf. Du Cange, iii, 565.)

[4] *in una communionis societate concordat.*

[5] Dr. Darwell Stone (*The Christian Church*, p. 143) quotes this passage, but translates *Cathedra* 'Episcopal See.' This is to miss the point. There is no question *here* of the origin of the Donatist See at Carthage, or as to whether that See was rightly claimed by Caecilian and Restitutus (the Catholic Bishops) on the one hand, or by Majorinus and Parmenian (the Donatists) on the other—a matter which has already been discussed in i, 10. *The present question is what have the Donatists to set against the Unica ac singularis Cathedra Petri.* To this Optatus replies in the next sentence (we must remember that he knew nothing of the present division into chapters) by suggesting that they might allege *their Bishops of Rome.* '*But* you allege, etc.' St. Optatus is engaged *exclusively* with the See of Rome in the present chapters ii to vi, from the time, that is, when he begins, until he ceases, to deal with the *Cathedra* as an Endowment of the Church.

[6] *sed et habere vos in Urbe Roma aliquam partem dicitis.*

[7] Harnack points out that Donatists realised so clearly the necessity of communion with the See of Peter, that in the early days of their schism they established a line of Anti-Popes, conse-

It is a branch of your error growing out of a lie, not from the root of truth. In a word, were Macrobius[1] to be asked where he sits in the City, will he be able to say on Peter's Cathedra? I doubt whether he has even set eyes upon it, and schismatic that he is, he has not drawn nigh to Peter's 'Shrine,'[2] against the precept of the Apostle who writes:

'Communicating with the "Shrines" of the Saints.'[3]

crating a Bishop for the purpose and sending him to Rome, to preside over their handful of adherents in the City. He writes as follows: 'The connection with Peter's Chair was of decisive importance, not only for Optatus, but also for his opponent, who had appealed to the fact that the Donatists had also a Bishop in Rome' (Harnack, *History of Dogma*, v, 155).

[1] The Donatist Bishop in Rome at the time. When later on in this chapter St. Optatus comes to give the list of the Donatist Anti-Popes, he evidently added in his second edition the names of Lucian and Claudian, at the same time that he added the name of Siricius to that of the Popes. (See Preface, p. xxii.)

[2] *ad cuius Memoriam non accedit.* Albaspinaeus translates *Relics*. But *Memoria* is a chapel or church built over the body of a Saint. Here it refers to the Basilica built by Constantine and destroyed in the sixteenth century, where Macrobius could naturally not say Mass. Over the body of St. Paul a small Basilica was erected by Constantine. The great church, burnt in 1826, was built in the fifth century, later than St. Optatus (cf. *Concil. Carthag.* 14: 'altaria, quae . . . tanquam *Memoriae* martyrum constituuntur').

[3] *Memoriis Sanctorum communicantes.* The reference is to Romans xii, 13. It is quite unintelligible to us until we learn that some ancient MSS. had ταῖς μνείαις instead of ταῖς χρείαις. The reading μνείαις is in the Acts of Pionius (second or third century) and in the bilingual codices D and G; it was therefore the Western and Old Latin reading. It is used, amongst others, by St. Hilary, Ambrosiaster, St. Peter Chrysologus and St. Gregory the Great, who writes (*De Verbis Domini* cxxxvii. 3, 7, last chapter): '*Communicatio Memoriis* sanctorum martyrum.' Both readings were known to Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome, Rufinus, Augustine and Pelagius. So we see that in following this reading St. Optatus does not stand alone. There is, however, little, if any, doubt that St. Paul really wrote ταῖς χρείαις.

Behold, in Rome are the 'Shrines' of the two Apostles. Will you tell me whether he has been able to approach them, or has offered Sacrifice in those places, where—as is certain—are these 'Shrines' of the Saints.

So it follows that your colleague Macrobius must confess that he sits where once sat Encolpius; and if Encolpius himself could be questioned, he would say that he sat where before him sat Bonifacius of Balla; and if Bonifacius could be asked, he would in his turn reply that he sat where Victor of Garba sat, whom some time ago your people sent from Africa to a few wanderers.[1]

How do you explain that your party has not been able to possess a Roman citizen as Bishop in Rome? How is it that in that City they were all Africans[2] and strangers who are known to have succeeded one another? Is not craft here manifest? Is this not the spirit of faction—the mother of schism?

This Victor of Garba was sent first, I will not say as a stone into a fountain (for he could not ruffle the pure waters of the Catholic people), but because some Africans who belonged to your party, having gone to Rome, and wishing to live there, begged that someone should be sent from Africa to preside over their public worship. So Victor was sent to them. He was there as a son without a father, as a beginner without a master, as a disciple without a teacher,

[1] *ad paucos erraticos*—a few Africans staying in Rome—strangers in the city—out of communion with its Church and Bishop—rebuked by its Cathedra—mere 'wanderers.'

[2] *toti Africani*. For *toti* = *omnes* cf. ii, 5: 'digiti, quos . . *totos*'; vii, 1: 'libri legis dominicae *toti* ubique recitantur.' Pope Miltiades was an African. The emphasis, therefore, is on the *toti*.

as a follower without a predecessor,[1] as a lodger without a home, as a guest without a guest-house, as a shepherd without a flock, as a Bishop without a people. For neither flock nor people can that handful be termed, who amongst the forty and more Basilicas in Rome, had not one place in which to assemble.

Accordingly they closed up[2] a cave outside the City with trellis-work,[3] where they might have a meeting-house at once,[4] and on account of this were called Mountaineers.[5]

Since then, Claudian has succeeded to Lucian, Lucian to Macrobius, Macrobius to Encolpius, Encolpius to Boniface, Boniface to Victor. Victor would not have been able, had he been asked where he sat,[6] to show that anyone had been there[7] before him, nor could he have pointed out that he possessed any Cathedra save the Cathedra of pestilence[8];

[1] *sequens sine antecedente* (cf. St. Cypr. *Ep. ad Magnum*, 3: 'Novatianus in Ecclesia non est, nec episcopus computari potest, quia evangelica et apostolica traditione contempta nemini succedens a se ipso ortus est').

[2] *saepserunt*. RB have *serpserunt*.

[3] *cratibus*. RBvb have *gradibus*. Casaubon adopts this, translates *saepserunt* 'they fortified,' and understands by *gradibus* steps going down to the cave from above. But *cratibus* is almost certainly the true reading.

[4] *ipso tempore conventiculum*. For *ipso tempore* Barthius conjectured *pro tempore*.

[5] *Montenses*. Mountaineers—from this 'cave,' which was made to look like a little mountain. St. Jerome writes (*In Chronico ad annum Christi* 336): 'Quidam sectatores Donati etiam Montenses vocant eo quod ecclesiam Romae primum in monte habere caeperunt.'

[6] *ubi sederet*, i.e. *on whose Chair* (*Cathedra*) *he sat*.

[7] *illic fuisse*, i.e. *on his Chair*.

[8] St. Optatus will soon make great play with this *Cathedra Pestilentiae* (Ps. i, 1), which he declares to belong to the Donatists.

for pestilence sends down its victims, destroyed by diseases, to the regions of Hell which are known to have their gates—gates against which we read that Peter received the saving Keys—Peter, that is to say, the first of our line,[1] to whom it was said by Christ :

'To thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,'

and these keys

'the gates of Hell shall not overcome.'[2]

How is it, then, that you strive to usurp for yourselves the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, you who, with your arguments, and audacious sacrilege, war against the Chair of Peter ?[3]

The Chair of Pestilence is ranged by him against the Chair of Peter. For 'Cathedra *Pestilentiae*' we may compare St. Ambrose (*comm. in cap.* xxiii *Matthaei*) : 'Quod autem ait super Cathedram Moysis . . . per Cathedram legis doctrinam ostendit. Ergo et illud quod dicitur in Psalmo "In Cathedra Pestilentiae non sedit," . . . doctrinam debemus accipere.'

[1] *Principem scilicet nostrum*, in contrast to Victor, who was the first 'Mountaineer' Bishop of Rome, or perhaps to the originators of the Schism, with whom Optatus often taunts the Donatists as being their *Principes*.

[2] *Claves regni coelorum tibi dabo, et portae inferorum non vincent eas.*

[3] *Unde est ergo, quod claves regni coelorum vobis usurpare contenditis, qui contra Cathedram Petri vestris praesumptionibus et audaci sacrilegio militatis ?* (Rvb have *audaciis*). It may well be noted that Optatus accused the Donatists of 'audacious sacrilege' (*audax sacrilegium*) in 'warring against' the Chair of Peter. Their 'warring' consisted, according to Optatus, in claiming the keys argumentatively for themselves—thus justifying themselves in remaining out of communion with the Holy See—and in ignoring the Judgement of Pope Miltiades. Cf. i, 24, 25. Mr. Denny (*Papalism*, n. 873) quotes this passage, but translates *usurpare* 'obtain,' and omits altogether *vestris praesumptionibus et audaci sacrilegio*. (For *praesumptionibus* cf. i, 7 : 'de inconsideratis praesumptionibus et erroribus vestris' ; v, 4 : 'quod praescribas praesumptionibus vestris' ; vii, 1 : 'praesumptiones vestrae.')

V. The Donatist Authors of Schism, Foes of Peace.

Thus do you repudiate the blessedness deserved by him who walked not in the counsel of the wicked, and did not stand in the way of sinners, and sat not on the Chair of Pestilence.[1] Your fathers walked in the counsel of the ungodly, to divide the Church. They also walked in the way of sinners, when they strove to divide Christ, whose garments not even the Jews would rend, though the Apostle Paul cries out and says:

'Is then Christ divided?'[2]

Would that your fathers, after having already walked in the evil way, had recognised their sin, and turned back upon themselves; would that they had set right their wicked deeds; would that they had recalled the Peace[3] which they had put to flight.

That would have been to turn back on their way, for on the way we have to walk, not stand still. But, since your fathers would not come back, it is certain that they *stood* in the way of sinners. They, whose steps had been impelled by mad wickedness, were held back, bound and benumbed by the spirit of strife; and, that they might not be able to return to better things, themselves placed the shackles of schism upon themselves, so that with obstinacy they stood in their error, and were not able to come back to the Peace which they had deserted. Nor

[1] Ps. i, 1.

[2] 1 Cor. i, 13.

[3] *quam fugaverunt pacem* (*Pax* here as elsewhere = the Unity of the Church. Cf. i, 1; vi, 1 etc.).

did they listen to the Holy Spirit speaking in the thirty-third Psalm :

'Turn away from evil and do good ; seek Peace and pursue it'[1];

but they *stood* in the way of their sins.

Your fathers also sat on the Chair of Pestilence, which, as we have said above, sends down to death those whom it has beguiled. But you, whilst by your zealous defence you pay homage to your fathers' error, have made yourselves the heirs of their wickedness, when you might have been, though late, the sons of Peace. For it has been written in the Prophet Ezekiel :

'Raise thy voice over the son of the sinner, that he follow not in his father's footsteps, since the soul of the father is Mine and Mine is the soul of the son. The soul which sins, alone shall be punished.'[2]

If you would disown your fathers' sin, they alone would have to give an account of their own deed.[3] By acting thus, even you might be blessed and receive praise from the mouth of the Prophet, who says in the first Psalm :

'Blessed is the man who hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly nor stood in the way of sinners, and has not sat in the Chair of Pestilence, but has his will in the Law of the Lord.'[4]

What does it mean to have the 'will in the Law,'

[1] Ps. xxxiii, 15.
[2] Ezek. xviii, 3–20.
[3] Cf. vii, 1 where the argument is elaborated, with reference to this passage in Ezekiel, contrasted with Exodus xx, 5.
[4] Ps. i, 1.

unless both to learn the divine precepts with piety, and fulfil them with fear—to have the will set on that Law in which it has been written (in the Gospel) :

'Peace on earth to men of good will,'[1]

and in another place (in Isaiah the Prophet[2]) :

'I will lay the foundations of peace in Sion,'

and in another (the eighty-fourth Psalm) :

'Let us see what the Lord shall say, for He shall speak peace to His people,'[3]

and in yet another (the seventy-fifth Psalm) :

'The Son of God has come, and His place has been set in peace,'[4]

and again (in the seventy-first Psalm) :

'Let the mountains receive peace for the people, and the hills justice,'[5]

and in the Gospel :

'My peace I give to you, My peace I leave to you'[6] ;

and Paul says :

'He who sows peace, peace also shall he reap,'[7]

[1] Luke ii, 14.
[2] Isaiah lx, 17.
[3] Ps. lxxxiv, 9.
[4] Ps. lxxv, 3.
[5] Ps. lxxi, 3.
[6] John xiv, 27.
[7] 'qui pacem seret, pacem et metet.' The reference is to 2 Cor. ix, 6, where the Vulgate reads : 'Qui parce seminat, parce et metet.' *Parce* is in accordance both with the Greek φειδομένως and with the context. Evidently, therefore, St. Optatus cannot be quoting from any Latin version, unknown to us, but the mistake is due simply to a slip of his memory. In the same way he will immediately supply the words 'In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' which is probably a reminiscence of 2 Cor. iii, 14.

and in all his epistles [1]:

'Let peace abound amongst you in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' [2];

and in the thirty-third Psalm:

'Seek peace and thou shalt obtain it.' [3]

Peace had been put to flight [4] by your fathers and departed. You ought to seek it as God has commanded, though, until now, you have neither been willing to seek it yourselves, nor to accept it, when it was freely offered to you.

For who is there in so many Provinces that has heard of whom you have been born,[5] and (if there be anyone who had heard this) who is there that does not marvel at your error? Who is there that does not condemn your wickedness? Wherefore, since it is clear, yea, clearer than the light itself, that we are with so many peoples who cannot be numbered, and that so many countries are with us; whilst you see that you are to be found only in a portion of one country; and that you, by your errors, are separated from the Church; in vain do you claim for yourselves alone this name of the Church with her Endowments, which are rather with us than with you.

Now these Endowments are connected one with another, and are distinct, but in such a way, that it

[1] St. Optatus is no doubt thinking of St. Paul's epistles in general, but he probably had especially in his mind Col. iii, 15, where the O.L. reading of D and G gives us 'Pax Christi *abundet* in cordibus vestris.'

[2] G alone amongst the MSS omits this sentence.

[3] Ps. xxxiii, 15.

[4] *fugata . . . pax* (cf. note 3, p. 74).

[5] Cf. note 1, p. 72.

may be understood that one cannot be separated from another. For they are numerically distinct, but with one act of the mind we see them joined in their Body,[1] as are the fingers on the hand—each of which we perceive to be removed by spaces from the others. Therefore he who possesses one, must possess them all, since not one of them can be apart from its fellows.[2]

We may add that we possess—and that in the strictest sense—not one Endowment alone, but all.

VI. The second Endowment of the Church, 'The *Angelus*,' or Bishop, is not with the Donatists.

So, of the above-mentioned Endowments, the *Cathedra* is, as we have said, the first, which we have proved to be ours, through Peter, and which draws to itself the ANGEL[3]—unless, perchance, you claim him for yourselves, and have him shut up somewhere or other.[4] Send him out if you can, and let him exclude from his communion seven angels, our colleagues in Asia, to whose churches wrote the Apostle John—churches with which[5] you cannot prove that you have any intercourse whatsoever.[6]

On what ground, then, can you maintain that you

[1] *suo iunguntur corpore* (sc. the Church).

[2] *ut in manu digiti, quos intervallis singulos videmus esse distinctos. Unde qui tenet unum, totos teneat necesse est, cum unus quisque a paribus separari non possit.*

[3] *quae ducit ad se Angelum.* St. Optatus, having shown that the Donatists have not the *Cathedra*, goes on to deny that they have the *Angelus* either. For it is the Chair of Peter that 'draws to itself the Bishop.'

[4] *habetis in loculis clausum.* Cf. ii, 1: 'In angustum coartatis Ecclesiam.'

[5] *ad quorum ecclesias . . . cum quibus ecclesiis.*

[6] The Donatists knew that they neither sent to these churches, nor received from them, *Litterae formatae.*

possess an Angel able to move the Fountain,[1] or one who, as such, can be numbered among the other Endowments of the Church ?

Whatever is without the Seven Churches is alien.[2]

[1] *qui apud vos possit fontem movere*—i.e. ' A Bishop able to give grace.' The reference is to John v, 4. It is interesting to see that this text was in the Version used by Parmenian.

[2] *extra Septem Ecclesias quicquid foris est alienum est.* (Cf. vi, 3: ' Orientalibus . . . ubi est septiformis Ecclesia.') Here, as elsewhere, St. Optatus supposes St. Cyprian to be familiar to his readers. St. Cyprian teaches that the Seven Macchabees are the type of the several churches, children of one Mother, and that on this account both St. Paul and St. John wrote to *seven* churches. (See *Ad Fortunatum* cap. xi. and *Testimonia* i, 20.) On the one hand St. Optatus never expected the Seven Churches of Asia to be overrun by the Turk, but on the other hand it is not likely that he supposed them to be infallible or indefectible, for the heresies in some had been sufficiently notorious. But he took the seven apostolic churches then existing in Asia as a real proof of Apostolicity, for one reason because Parmenian evidently had referred to them by mentioning the *Angel* as one of the Endowments. St. Optatus retorts, ' We are actually in communion with these Seven Churches, but you are not ! ' Whatever is without the Seven Churches (not, I think, necessarily *these particular* seven churches mentioned in the Apocalypse, for if Optatus had wished to say this, he would, as elsewhere, have written 'extra *quas* septem Ecclesias,' (cf. 'ad *quorum* Ecclesias,' ' cum *quibus* Ecclesiis,' etc., *supra*,) but whatever is without Cyprian's mystical Seven) is outside (*foris*), is alien (*alienum*). In all probability *foris* and *alienum* are used as synonyms (see i, 11, ' dum foras exeunt et se separant ' ; so Cyprian, *Ep. ad Anton.* i, 8, writes of a schismatic Bishop 'profanus est, *alienus* est, *foris* est '), though Ziwsa says that *alienum* here = *diversum*. Optatus has already written (i, 12) that heretics are ' ab hortulo et a paradiso Dei alieni ' ; he now writes simply that ' whatever is schismatic' is ' *alienum* '—is alien, is foreign to, is not within ' God's garden '—the Catholic Church. (We may compare St. Ambrose in *Ep.* I. *Ad Cor.* iii, 15, 'Extra Catholicam quicquid est, contrarium est.') St. Augustine takes up and several times uses this appeal to the Apostolic churches of the East. It is sometimes compared by non-Catholic controversialists to the patristic appeal to communion with Rome. But the work of St. Optatus is by itself enough to show the lack of parity. The duty of union with the Cathedra Petri is put forward as of primary and absolute necessity, because it is *the* Cathedra, because Peter alone received the keys, and the like. There are no parallel

Supposing then that you really had even one *Angel* who belongs to the Church, through that one *Angel* you would be in communion with other *Angels* too, and through them with the above-mentioned Churches, and through these Churches [1] with us also.

statements—evidently none could be made—in any of the Fathers about any other See, save the See of Rome. A Catholic in England before the Reformation might have said with perfect truth: 'Whoever is not in communion with the See of Canterbury is outside the Church'; as a Catholic to-day may say with equal truth: 'Whoever is not in communion with the See of Westminster is outside the Church.' It in no wise follows that the See of Canterbury has not fallen, nor that the See of Westminster may not (*quod avertat Deus*) fall into schism. Such immunity from schism and heresy can be predicated of One See alone—itself the Centre of Unity—set up for this very purpose, 'that unity might be preserved by all'—the *Cathedra Singularis* of St. Optatus (cf. note 2, p. 67).

[1] *et per angelos supra memoratis ecclesiis et per ipsas Ecclesias nobis.* As Optatus proceeds immediately to urge, it is an incontrovertible principle of Catholicism that he who is in communion with one member of the Body is thereby *ipso facto* in communion with the other members, and with the whole Body; whereas he who is out of communion with one member is out of communion with all. The test is of easy application, and is most often made (as Optatus made it) primarily in relation to the See of Peter, but we may apply it with equal certainty to any See which *without controversy* belongs to the Catholic Church. Thus St. Optatus applied it to the Seven Churches mentioned in the Apocalypse. We can apply it, say, to the Church of Madrid, concerning which there can be no doubt that it is Catholic. So, if any man (or any organised religious body) claims to be Catholic, we may ask at once: 'Are you in communion with the Bishop of Madrid? If so, through the Bishop of Madrid, you are in communion with the whole Catholic Church, and since we (whom perhaps you call "Roman Catholics") are in communion with the Bishop of Madrid, you must also be in communion with us—which is manifestly untrue and—unless you too are in communion with Rome—ridiculous. But if you are not in communion with the Bishop of Madrid (who is, as you freely acknowledge, a Catholic Bishop), you are thereby convicted of being outside the Church, and are not a Catholic, whatever you may be pleased to call yourself.' This is the argument of St. Optatus, and of Catholics generally in every age. It at once makes

If these things be as I have stated them, you have lost your case.[1]

VII. The third Endowment, *Spiritus*, the Holy Spirit, is in the Church, not with the Donatists.

Now perhaps you will see that the Endowments of the Church cannot be with you, for you cannot claim for yourselves alone the SPIRIT of God,[2] nor can you shut up[3] (in a small corner of Africa) Him

the question of the validity of Orders irrelevant to the main issue, and raises the discussion to a higher plane—to the analogy of the mystical Body of Christ with a human body, in which, so long as the eye (or any other member) is in union with the hand (provided only that the hand is in union with the heart), both live; but the moment that separation comes, one, or both, must be out of the body.

[1] 'If you are not in communion with any Catholic Bishops your position is hopeless; but if you are in communion with any Catholic Bishops you must through them be in communion with us, for we are in communion with them.' (This is, of course; the *reductio ad absurdum* of which we have spoken in the preceding note.) 'But if you are in communion with us, you cannot have any longer any case against us. You have lost your case.' It is possible that by *Angelus*, St. Optatus does not in this passage understand the Bishop himself, but the Guardian Angel of the Church, who attends upon the Bishop. In this case his argument will be precisely the same: 'If you have an Angel shut up in a box, send him to Asia, and tell him to treat the Apostolic Churches there as excluded from the true Church, and to cut off their Angels, to whom St. John wrote, from his communion. Your Angel, if you have one, will not do that. So if you are not in communion with those Angels, how can you have an Angel at all? Are not all the Angels in communion with one another? And the Seven Churches are a type of the whole Church. Conversely, if you have an Angel, he must be in communion with the other Angels and therefore with those Apostolic Churches, and (as we are in communion with them) then you must be in communion with us, and so your whole attack upon us breaks down.' Whether *Angelus* means Angel or Bishop, the argument is the same, and clear.

[2] St. Optatus passes to the third Endowment of the Church, the *Spirit* of adoption, whereby we are the sons of God. Parmenian had claimed this for the Donatists, and had said that it could not belong to the Catholic Church, whose sons he declared (as we shall see in a moment) to be the sons, not of God, but of Hell.

[3] *includere* (cf. 'inclusus in templis,' ii, 15).

whose Presence we recognise though we see it not.[1] For so has it been written in the Gospel :

'God is a Spirit,' and 'breatheth where He willeth, but you hear not His voice, nor do you know whence He cometh and whither He goeth.'[2]

Permit God to come whence He willeth, and allow Him freedom to go where He pleaseth. He can be heard, but He cannot be seen. And yet, through your lust for calumny, you have been pleased to blaspheme and say :

'What *Spirit* can there be in that Church,[3] excepting one which should give birth to sons of Hell ?'[4]

Thou[5] hast vomited forth thine invective and hast thought that thou mightest thus be able to strengthen thyself by producing testimony from the Gospel, where we read :

'Woe to you, hypocrites, who compass seas and lands to make one proselyte, and when you have found him, make him a son of Hell twofold worse than yourselves.'[6]

[1] *quod intelligitur et non videtur.*

[2] This is a combination of John iv, 24 with John iii, 8.

[3] *in illa Ecclesia*, i.e. the Catholic Church. Optatus is quoting from Parmenian's treatise.

[4] In reading the history of the Donatists we are reminded again and again of English Puritans and Scotch Covenanters. Sir Walter Scott, in some of the Waverley Novels, puts upon the lips of the soldiers of Cromwell and the disciples of Calvin and John Knox almost the identical words that St. Optatus puts upon the lips of Parmenian and his friends.

[5] As in many other places, St. Optatus now passes abruptly, when addressing Parmenian, from the plural to the single number. I have endeavoured throughout to make these transitions as far as possible in the translation, though it is often the case (as here) that they possess no significance.

[6] Matt. xxiii, 15.

If this accusation—unjust and groundless though it be—had to be made at all, would that it had been made by any other of your party than yourself.[1] Indeed I am lost in wonder that you, of all men, should have dared falsely to bring against another a charge, the very thought of which might well make you blush, were you but to consider your own Consecration. For you have reminded us that we read in the Gospel:

'Woe to you, hypocrites, who compass seas and lands to make one proselyte'—

that is, to change his sect. As for you personally, I have no idea to what sect you previously belonged. But your quotation was unfortunate. I think that perhaps you are already sorry that you made it.[2] Is it we who have travelled through any lands? Is it we who have compassed any seas? Is it we who have set sail to foreign ports? Is it we who have brought in a Spaniard or a Gaul? Have we consecrated a foreigner, not known to our people?[3]

[1] As Parmenian was not an African, he was the one Donatist who should have been most careful not to have said 'you compass sea and land.' This charge had better have been made, if at all, by anyone else.

[2] *tamen importune a te hoc dictum est. Aestimo quod te iam forte huius dicti poeniteat.* So PG. Ziwsa with the other MSS. reads *dictum esse aestimo quod*, etc. But this is hard to translate, and we do well always to remember in case of any doubt that P is much the best MS.

[3] It was against the Canon Law of the time to bring in a foreigner to be consecrated Bishop, as it was considered of great importance that he should be already well-known to the people over whom he was to rule. For this reason Optatus reproaches Parmenian with being a *peregrinus* (cf. iii, 3).

VIII. Concerning the *Fons*, the *Sigillum* and the *Umbilicus*.

It is certain that the FOUNTAIN [1] also is one of the Endowments, from which heretics can neither drink themselves, nor give others to drink. For, as they alone [2] do not possess the SEAL, that is to say the Catholic Creed, in its integrity, they cannot open the true *Fountain*.

* * * * *

For [3] since it has been written in the Canticle of Canticles :

'Thy Navel is as a round goblet,' [4]

you have tried to say that the *Navel* is the Altar. If the Navel be a member of the body, from the fact that it is a member, it cannot be amongst the Endowments. To be an Ornament, it must not be part of the body.[5]

[1] St. Optatus now comes to the consideration of *Fons* and *Sigillum*. He passes swiftly over these Endowments, since (as he has said, ii, 3) the *Cathedra* is the first. That Church which has the *Cathedra* has them all, and is proved by this very fact—through union with the Chair of Peter—to have the others also (ii, 5—6). As is obvious, Optatus was precluded by his statement that the Donatists were schismatics and not heretics from proving *directly* that they are without the fourth and fifth Endowments. Therefore he contents himself with having already proved it indirectly and inferentially by his statement that, since they have not the first Endowment, they cannot have the rest, and merely agrees with them that they are right in stating that heretics cannot have either the Fountain or the Seal.

[2] *soli*, in contradistinction to Catholics.

[3] *nam*. This word (*for*) depends upon nothing to be found in any MS. ; moreover, the transition is so abrupt, that it seems almost certain that some connecting passage has been lost. Hence the asterisks. St. Optatus having discussed the nature of the Endowments, and having proved that they belong to the Catholic Church alone, proceeds to discuss their number, and to argue that they are five, not (as Parmenian had alleged) six.

[4] Cant. vii, 2.

[5] St. Optatus looked upon these Endowments as something external to the Body of Christ. He regarded what we now call the

The Endowments then are seen to be Five. Since these Endowments belong to the Catholic Church (which is in so many countries already mentioned by us), they cannot be wanting to us here in Africa.

IX. The Endowments of the Church are with Catholics; not with Donatists.

Understand, however late, that you are disobedient sons, that you are boughs broken off from the tree, that you are branches cut off from the vine, that you are a river separated from its source. For that stream which is small and which is derived from another cannot be the source. Nor can the tree be cut off from the branch,[1] since the tree, which has been planted and is alive, has its own roots; whereas the branch, which has been cut off, withers and dies.

Now do you see, my brother Parmenian, now

Notes, or Marks, of the Church as two. The true Church is *One* and *Catholic* (of world-wide extension). When the Church of Christ has been thus identified, as the Church which is One and is Everywhere (*ubique*), Optatus agrees with Parmenian as to her five Endowments, but explains them very differently. According to the mind of Optatus they are: (1) First and foremost—Union with the Chair of Peter (*Cathedra*); (2) Apostolic Succession (*Angelus*); (3) The Spirit of sonship (*Spiritus*); (4) The Baptismal Font, or perhaps the True Faith (*Fons*); (5) The Seal of the Faith—the Creed (*Sigillum*). These Endowments are distinctive and characteristic of Catholicism. They are gifts from God *ab extra* bestowed upon His Bride the Church. It can be proved to-day that the One Church, which is not merely local, but is scattered through all the nations, still possesses these 'Endowments,' e.g. is still in union with the See of Peter ('Cathedra Petri quae nostra est'; cf. note 2, p. 86). On the other hand, it will be seen immediately that any religious body out of communion with the Catholic Church is without one at least of these Endowments, e.g. has not the Cathedra Petri, from which unhappily it is severed.

[1] *non potest arbor a ramo concidi.* G has 'non potest esse arbor ramus concisus' ('nor can the branch which has been cut off be the tree'). This reading is adopted by Du Pin, as being *ad mentem scriptoris*. But we are not free to choose an easy reading in G against an unexpected, and therefore harder, reading in the other MSS.

do you recognise, now do you understand, that by your arguments you have fought against yourself?

For it has been proved that we are in the Holy Catholic Church, who have too the Creed of the Trinity[1]; and it has been shown that, through the Chair of Peter which is ours—through it[2]—the other Endowments also belong to us.

Again, ours is the *Sacerdotium*, which you have affected to regard as in our case of no account[3]—by way of some excuse for your error and hatred in re-baptising after us—though this you do not after your own people, even when they have been proved guilty of sin; for you have maintained that, if the priest be in sin,[4] the Endowments are able to work alone.[5]

So—to answer you—we have shown what is heresy, and what is schism, and which is the Holy Church, and that of this Holy Church there has been constituted a Representative,[6] and that the Catholic

[1] *apud quos et Symbolum Trinitatis est.* This means the Creed which expresses Faith in the Trinity. St. Optatus has in the preceding chapter written of the '*Sigillum*: id est *Symbolum Catholicum.*' Cf. also St. Augustine's work *De Fide et Symbolo.*

[2] *per Cathedram Petri, quae nostra est, per ipsam et ceteras dotes apud nos esse.*

[3] The Donatists held that Catholic priests who had been guilty of the wickedness of Betrayal, thereby had lost their sacerdotal powers, and especially that their Bishops could not ordain validly. As a result they dared to deny that the Eucharist consecrated by Catholics was the Body of Christ, and were even guilty of the horrible sacrilege of casting It to dogs (cf. ii, 19).

[4] Other than the sin of *Traditio.*

[5] *quod, si sacerdos in peccato sit, solae possint dotes operari.*

[6] *et huius Sanctae Ecclesiae constituta est Persona. Persona* means first a mask, and thence a representative. There can be no doubt that St. Optatus is here referring to St. Peter, or his

Church is the Church which is scattered over the whole world (of which we amongst others are members), and that her Endowments are with her everywhere.[1]

We have also shown in our first Book that we cannot justly be reproached with the crime of Betrayal,

successor in the See of Rome, as the Representative of the Church. This is made clear by the fact that he is giving a summary of the arguments which he has already brought forward in his book. Now amongst these arguments the representative character of St. Peter and of his *Cathedra* has, as we have just seen, taken a leading place. Again, no alternative explanation of *Persona* in this passage has ever been suggested. Further, it is well known that St. Augustine adopted this traditional view, and in several passages has written of St. Peter as representing the whole Catholic Church in his own person: e.g. Gestat enim Petrus *Ecclesiae* plerumque *personam* (*Sermo de Verb. Evangel. Matt.* lxxiv. 10); Petrus a petra cognominatus beatus, *Ecclesiae figuram* portans, apostolatus principatum tenens etc. (*Sermo* lxxvi. ut supra); Petrus in multis locis Scripturarum apparet quod *personam* gestet *Ecclesiae* (*Sermo* cxlix. 7 *de Verbis Act.* cap. x); Nam et ipsum Petrum, cui commendavit oves suas quasi alter alteri, unum Secum facere volebat, ut sic ei oves commendaret, *ut esset Ille Caput, ille figuram Corporis portaret, id est, Ecclesiae,* et tanquam sponsus et sponsa essent duo in carne una (*Sermo de Pastoribus in Ecclesia,* xlvi. 30 etc., etc.).

[1] *cuius dotes apud illam ubique sunt.* 'The Endowments of the Church are with her everywhere.' Therefore, the Chair of Peter (according to the expressed mind of Optatus the chief of the Endowments) is with the Catholic Church (as well as the others—the local Bishop, the Holy Spirit, the Faith and the Creed) wherever she may be, in whatever part of the world. This See is the first and typical See, with which all Catholic Bishops are in communion *ubique.* It was idle then for Parmenian to appeal to *his* Cathedra. It was not the 'Cathedra unica'; it was not *ubique.* If in all parts of the world there are *Cathedras*, if Italy and Asia have succession of Bishops as well as Africa, and if in Africa there are now rival *Cathedras,* the question arises: 'Which is the true Cathedra? Where is the true Church?' To this Optatus gives the answer: That is the true Cathedra in every place on which is seated a Bishop in communion with the original Cathedra at Rome; there also is the true Church, for 'the Catholic Church is the Church which is scattered over the whole world and her Endowments are with her everywhere.'

and that this crime has been condemned not only by you, but by us also.[1]

X. Catholics possess the Sacraments.

Now I should like you to tell me this. Why have you thought well to speak only of the Endowments of the Church, and have said nothing about her holy members and her inward organs,[2] which without doubt are in the Sacraments and in the Names of the Trinity[3]? These Names are met by Faith and its profession, recorded upon the Acts of the Angels[4]; here are sown heavenly and spiritual seeds, so that, for those who are born again, a new nature[5] may be procreated from a holy germ, and he who had once been born to the world may, where the Trinity meets Faith, be spiritually new-born[6] to God.

[1] The Donatist argument may be stated as follows in syllogistic form:

Bishops and Priests guilty of the crime of Betrayal can no longer use validly the power of their Orders;

*But* you Catholics have been guilty of this crime of Betrayal;

*Therefore* . . .

To this Optatus here replies to the Major Premise, '*Transeat* (let it pass, for the sake of argument), but to the Minor Premise, *Nego Minorem*. We never were Betrayers, and we always condemned the sin of Betrayal.'

[2] *de sanctis eius membris ac visceribus tacuisti.*

[3] *Nominibus Trinitatis, id est Personis Trinitatis.* (Cf. v, 3 'aqua sancta quae de Trium Nominum fontibus inundat.') St. Optatus now passes to the question of the One Baptism conferred in the Name of the Trinity. One of the chief crimes of the Donatists consisted in the repetition of Baptism administered by Catholics.

[4] *Professio [fidei] quae apud acta conficitur Angelorum.* Tertullian had stated that an Angel was present at Baptism (*De Baptismo*, vii, 5, 6), and St. Augustine has written (*De Symbolo ad Catech.*) 'Videte, dilectissimi, quia hanc *professionem* vestram in *curiam* profertis Angelorum.' These last words are an echo of those of Optatus in the text.

[5] *nova indoles.*

[6] The metaphor is of the Marriage of the Trinity with the

In this way does God become the Father of men, thus does the Holy Church become their Mother.

I perceive that all these things have been left unmentioned by you, on purpose, lest in them all, the true principles of Baptism [1] might be recognised, in which there is nothing that the human minister may, after your fashion, claim for himself.

For this reason you determined to occupy yourself with the Endowments alone, which you have denied to Catholics, vainly striving to claim them for yourselves exclusively, having clutched them, as it were in your hand, or shut them up in a box.[2] Although the question is about regeneration, and man's renovation, you have made no mention either of Faith or of its profession by the Faithful. You determined rather to speak of the Endowments alone, and have passed over in silence all these things without which spiritual faith and reparation cannot exist. And although the Endowments belong to the Spouse, not the Spouse to the Endowments, you dealt with the Endowments as if life were given by them, not by the inward organs, which we understand to be rather in the Sacraments than in the Ornaments.

XI. The Church is rightly called Paradise, but it belongs to the wide world.

Nor do I pass over the fact that you have said openly that the Church is (as we believe) a Paradise—a thing which without doubt is true—a garden in which God sets His little trees. And yet you have denied to God His rich possessions by compressing His garden

Profession of Faith, producing a seed, a germ. Cf. S. Leo, *Serm.* 4 *de Nativ. Domini*: 'Aqua baptismatis instar est uteri virginalis, eodem Spiritu Sancto replente fontem, qui replevit et Virginem.'

[1] *ratio baptismatis.* [2] *aut arca conclusas.*

into a narrow corner,[1] claiming without reason everything for yourselves alone. Surely the plantations of God, through different precepts, have different seeds. The just, the continent, the merciful, the virgins are spiritual seeds. Of these seeds God raises little plants in His Paradise. Grant to God that His garden be spread far and wide. Why do you deny to Him the Christian peoples of East and North, also those of all the provinces of the West and of innumerable islands —with whom you share no fellowship of communion— against whom you—few in number and rebels—are ranged, in isolation?

XII. From the prayer of Oblation we gather that the One Church is Everywhere.

It is now time to condemn, as is only right, your falsehood, with which each day you season your Sacrifices.[2] For who can doubt that you dare not pass over what is prescribed in the Mystery of the Sacraments?[3] You say that you offer the Sacrifice to God on behalf of the Church, which is One. This

[1] *cuius hortum in angustias cogitis.*

[2] *mendacium . . . quo cotidie a vobis sacrificia condiuntur.*

[3] *nam quis dubitet vos illud legitimum in sacramentorum mysterio praeterire non posse?* The word *legitimum* is a reference to the prescribed words of the Liturgy. St. Optatus tells us (iv, 6) that the Donatists used the Baptismal Exorcism 'Maledicte, exi foras.' So St. Augustine (*De pecc. origin.* ii, 40; cf. *con. Iul. Pelag.* iii, 5) observes that in the Baptism of children the Pelagians replied to the question, '*abrenuntias Satanae?*', though they denied that these children were subject to original sin. Similarly, St. Cyprian (*Ep. ad Magnum* 7) tells us that the Novatians did not venture to pass over in Baptism the solemn words, '*credis remissionem peccatorum?*', and continued thus, '*et vitam aeternam per Sanctam Ecclesiam?*'; yet they believed not in the Forgiveness of Sins and did not belong to the Holy Church. Throughout history we find heretics employing venerable creeds and solemn prayers, the sense of which they have, often long since, abjured. Thus St. Augustine (*De dono Persev.* xiii, 33) turned their use of the

in itself is part of your falsehood, to call that One, of which you have made Two. You proclaim that you sacrifice to God on behalf of the One Church, which has been spread throughout the whole world.

But what reply would you make were God to say to any one of you :

'Why dost *thou* offer sacrifice for the Whole—thou who art not in the Whole ?'

If we are displeasing to you, what wrong has the City of Antioch done you, or the Province of Arabia [1] ?

Yet we are able to prove that those who come from Antioch and Arabia have been rebaptised by you.

XIII. The praise bestowed upon the Church by Parmenian belongs to Catholics.

In one thing alone we cannot be ungrateful to you, my brother Parmenian. You have praised our Church [2] (that is the Catholic, which is contained throughout the entire world)—although you do not belong to her [3]—by enumerating her Endowments (mistaken though you are as to their number) and by teaching that she is a garden enclosed and a fountain sealed up, and the only Bride.[4]

Preface in the Mass against the Pelagians in these words : 'Quod ergo in Sacramentis Fidelium dicitur, ut sursum habeamus corda ad Dominum, munus est Domini ; de quo munere ipsi Domino Deo nostro gratias agere a sacerdote post hanc vocem, quibus hoc dicitur, admonentur, et dignum ac iustum esse respondent.'

[1] With whom you are out of communion, just as much as you are out of communion with us.

[2] *Ecclesiam nostram.* Cf. 'Cathedra per Petrum *nostra*' (ii, 6) ; 'Cathedra Petri, quae *nostra* est' (ii, 9).

[3] *quamvis ab ea sis alienus* (cf. ii, 6 : 'quicquid foris est, alienum est').

[4] *unica Sponsa.*

This we say of that which is our own; you have said it of that which does not belong to you.[1] Whatever you have been able to say in praise of the Church, we, before you, have said the same. We too, with you, condemn the Betrayers—those men whom, if you remember, we have shown up in our first Book.

And although we are in communion with the whole [Catholic] world, and all the Provinces are in communion with us, you for some time past have thought well to provide two churches,[2] as if Africa alone had Christian people—that Africa in which, through your fault, two parties have been made! And you—not remembering Christ, who says that His Spouse is One—have said, not that there are two parties in Africa, but two Churches. Without doubt that Church is One, to which it has been granted to be pointed out by the Word of Christ, who says:

'One is My dove; My spouse is One.'[3]

XIV. The Catholics have done nothing with cruelty.

But you, having forgotten this, have used these words in order to stir up hatred against Catholics:

'That,' you have said, 'cannot rightly be called a Church which battens on bloody morsels, and is fattened on the blood and the flesh of the Saints.'

The Church has her own determinate members—Bishops, priests, deacons, clerics,[4] and the mass of

[1] *de alieno locutus es.*

[2] Optatus complains that Parmenian was content with contrasting the rival churches in Africa, ignoring in his argument the rest of the Catholic world, as though the controversy could be settled solely by reference to what had happened in Africa.

[3] Cant. vi, 8.

[4] *ministros.* This word includes all Minor Orders.

the faithful.[1] Tell us against which class of men in our Church[2] the charge that you have thought well to bring can be proved. Name some cleric individually, point out some deacon by his name; show that this evil thing has been done by some priest; prove the guilt of Bishops. Make us see that any one of our people has plotted against any man. Who of us has persecuted any one? Who is there on your side, of whom you can either say or prove that he has been persecuted by us?

Unity displeases you.

So—if you deem it to be a crime, convict us of being in communion with Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians and the Seven Churches which are in Asia.

If it seems to you wicked or a proof of guilt to communicate with the 'shrines'[3] of the Apostles and of all the Saints, far from denying this, we make it our boast.

XV. The Peace and Happiness of the Church before it was disturbed by the Donatists.

But that I may show that—to quote your words[4]—it was your party which

'has battened on bloody morsels, and has been fattened on the blood and flesh of Christians,'

your rabid madness must now be described from its beginning; now the story of your wickedness must be related anew; now your folly must be proved.

First we have to show that the cause of your gladness ought to be your shame, and how wicked is

[1] *turbam fidelium.*

[2] *in Ecclesia nostra.* Cf. note 2, p. 91.

[3] Cf. ii, 4 supra.

[4] *ut dixisti.* RBvbd have *ut dixi.* But for the words of Parmenian, cf. ii, 14; ii, 18.

your joy at having received[1] liberty to return to your original wrongdoing.

Go over again the times that are past, enter into the sequence of events,[2] consider how different were the persons concerned, and how different were their aims.[3]

Recall Constantine[4] the Christian Emperor to your memory. Think of the service which he rendered to God, and remember his ardent desire that schism should be removed, and all dissension die away, so that Holy Mother Church might see, rejoicing, her children throughout the world living in unity. He restored the unity of communion; he gave back wives to husbands, children to parents, brothers to brothers.

These are the things concerning which God bears witness that He is well pleased, when He says in the hundred and thirty-second Psalm:

> 'Behold how good and how pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.'[5]

For Peace in unity[6] joined together the peoples of Africa and of the East, and the rest beyond the sea,[7] and this unity itself,[8] through the representation

[1] From Julian the Apostate.

[2] *rationem rerum.*

[3] The contrast is between the Christian and the heathen ruler.

[4] All the MSS. have *Constantinus*. But at the beginning of the next chapter we shall read that, 'as was known to all men,' this Emperor was succeeded by Julian. Therefore, either we must read Constans against the MSS., or it was a slip of the pen on the part of Optatus.

[5] Ps. cxxxii, 1.

[6] *Pax una.*

[7] *Africanos populos et orientales et ceteros transmarinos* (Africa, Asia, Europe).

[8] *ipsa unitas.*

of all its members, made the Body of the Church solid. And then over this the Devil, whom it always tortures to see brethren living in peace, was sorely vexed.

At that time, under a Christian Emperor, Satan, as if shut up in the idols, lay abandoned in his temples. Your leaders too and first fathers had been sent, as they deserved; into banishment. In the Church there were no schisms. Pagans were not allowed their sacrilegious rites. Peace, beloved by God, dwelt amongst all Christian peoples. The devil mourned in his temples ; you mourned in foreign lands.

XVI. The Edict of Julian.

Next, as is known to all men, there followed another Emperor, who, in conjunction with you, devised evil plans, and from the servant of God became the tool of God's enemy. His edicts bore him witness that he was an apostate. Yet this was the man whom you entreated to be allowed to return.[1] If you deny that you sent such entreaties, we reply that we have read them. Nor did he whom you entreated make difficulties. He commanded you to come back,[2] as you asked. For he knew well that you would come, with fierceness, to break up Peace.[3]

If you have any shame, blush.

The same decree, which gave freedom to you, ordered the temples to be opened to their idols.[4]

XVII. The madness and cruelty of the Donatists.

You returned, in your madness, to Africa almost

[1] *ut reverti possetis.*

[2] *ire.* We should probably read *redire,* the word found in the next chapter.

[3] *ad disturbandam Pacem.*

[4] Cf. S. August. *Ep.* cxlviii ; clxvi ; and *con. Petil.* ii, 92.

at the moment when the devil was loosed from his dungeons.

Still you do not blush—you who, at the same time as the Enemy, have reasons for rejoicing, which you share with him.

You came raging ; you came full of wrath, rending the members of the Church ; subtle in your deceits ; savage in your slaughters, provoking the children of Peace to war. A large number you banished from their homes. Approaching with a hired band, you rushed upon the Basilicas. Many of your party throughout numerous districts (which it would be too long to mention by their names) worked massacres so bloody, that the judges of the time sent a report to the Emperor [1] concerning deeds of such atrocity.

But the Judgement of God intervened and came to our aid, so that the Emperor who had already long ago ordered you to come back,[2] and who, at your instigation, had arranged, or was even then arranging, for our persecution, died in the midst of his profanity and sacrileges.

XVIII. The Donatists' murderous deeds.

Catholics were slaughtered in the above-mentioned districts. You remember how your people ran to and fro from place to place. Were not Felix of Zaba and Januarius of Flumenpiscinum of your party, and the others who rushed all together as swiftly as they could, to a fortified place called Lemella [3] ?

[1] *ut relatio mitteretur*. *Relatio* is a technical term for an official report from the Provinces to the Emperor.

[2] *redire*.

[3] *ad castellum Lemellefi* P. *Lemellensi* Rd. *Lemellesi* G. Ziwsa writes *Lemellefense*, an emendation which he justifies in his Index.

So soon as they saw that the Basilica, notwithstanding their clamours, was closed against them, they commanded their followers to climb to the top, strip the roof, and throw down the tiles. These orders were executed without delay. In the defence of the altar, a number of Catholic deacons were wounded with tiles—of whom two were killed—Primus the son of Januarius, and Donatus the son of Ninus. Your fellow-Bishops, whose names I have just given, were present and urged them on, so that, without doubt, of your party has it been said :

'Their feet are swift to shed blood.'[1]

Primosus, the Catholic Bishop of the place, complained of all this—whilst you listened disingenuously to his complaints—at your Council held in the City of Theneste.

See then how *you* did the things, of which you have said :

'That is not the Church which battens on bloody morsels';

and again you have said :

'Soldiers sent to war are one thing, consecrated Bishops are another.'

What in your hatred you bring as a charge against us was done by others, not by us ; that which you say ought not to have been done, has been done by you.

Lemella was in Mauritania Sitifensis. Cf. The Roman Martyrology for Feb. 9 : 'In Africa in Castello Lemellensi Sanctorum Martyrum Primi et Donati diaconorum, qui cum altare in Ecclesia tuerentur, a Donatistis occisi sunt.'

[1] Ps. xiii, 2.

You have recalled how the most blessed Apostle Paul has said that the Church ought to be [1] without wrinkle and without stain.[2] In the presence, and at the order, of your Bishops, Catholic deacons were slain over the altar.[3]

The same things happened also at Carpi.[4] Do not such deeds appear to you indelible stains? When you came into the cities of Mauritania, the people were overwhelmed with dread, so that children who were near to birth died in their mothers' wombs. Does not this seem to you to be a 'wrinkle' such as cannot be stretched or made smooth [5] by any reparation whatsoever? What have *we* done of such a character as this? We wait for the vengeance of God.

And yet you create a prejudice against Macarius, although anything that he may have done with harshness on behalf of unity may well be regarded as of light account, when compared with these monstrous, bitter, bloodstained acts of war done by you on behalf of dissension. Why should I mention Tipasa, a city of Mauritania Caesariensis, whither rushed from Numidia Urban of Forma and Felix of Idicra, two burning torches, set on fire by hatred [6]? These men upset the minds of quiet people, who were established in unity,[7] and, aided by the favour and fury of certain officials, in the very presence of Athenias the magis-

[1] *esse debere.*

[2] Cf. Eph. v, 27.

[3] *supra altare* (cf. S. Augus. *con. Cresc.* iii, 43).

[4] *apud Carpos.* A town in Proconsular Africa. Cf. 'Antonius Episcopus plebis Carpitanae' (*Coll. Carthag.* i, 126).

[5] *tendi aut explanari.*

[6] *duae faculae, incensi livoribus.*

[7] *in Pace positorum.*

trate, with colours flying,[1] broke up the Catholic assemblies, with bloodshed. Catholics were driven out from their homes. Their men were wounded. Their women were dragged into captivity. Their infants were slain. Mothers miscarried.

Look now at your church. Under the guidance of its Bishops it

'battened on bloody morsels.'

After all this, you have gone on to say:

'Let the greed of vultures consume whatever it will; still the number of doves is greater.'[2]

What, then, has happened to the common saying that a liar should have his memory in due keeping? Have you forgotten what you said a moment before, that in the Canticle of Canticles

'The Church is Christ's one Dove'[3]?

If yours is the One Church, the Dove is One. What then did you mean by saying that

'the number of doves is greater'?

XIX. The Eucharist was given by the Donatists to dogs. An Ampulla of Chrism was thrown away. Their other sacrileges.

Moreover, a hideous crime (which seems to you something of little importance)[4] was committed, in such a fashion that your above-mentioned fellow-Bishops profaned everything which is most holy. They commanded the Eucharist to be cast to the dogs. This did not pass without evidence of the

[1] *cum signis* (sc. militaribus).

[2] With this reference to the boast of the Donatists that they were 'doves,' we may compare St. Augustine (*con. Pet.* ii, 83): 'Isto modo et milvus, cum pullos rapere territos non potuerit, columbam se nominat.'

[3] Cf. Cant. vi, 8.

[4] *quod vobis leve videtur, facinus inmane.*

Divine Judgement, for these same dogs were inflamed with madness, and tore their own masters in pieces as though they had been murderers,[1] and attacked with avenging teeth those guilty of the Holy Body,[2] as if they had been strangers and enemies.

They also threw a phial of chrism out of a window, in order to break it, and although its fall was precipitated by violence, an angel's hand was there to bring it down gently to earth, with the support that is from heaven. Though thrown away, it was not allowed to feel its fall, but, by the protection of God, found its home unbroken amongst the rocks.[3]

[1] *latrones*. Cf. 'Christus percussus est in altari' (vi, 1). For *latro* see note 9, p. 166.

[2] *Sancti Corporis reos* (cf. 1 Cor. xi, 27). Mr. Sparrow Simpson, giving a summary account of this passage in Optatus, observes (*op. cit.* p. 39): 'The consecrated elements from the altars were flung to the dogs.' St. Optatus writes nothing concerning 'the consecrated elements.' The very word 'elements' would, have been incomprehensible to him in this connection. He *does* call the Eucharist 'the Holy Body' and 'the Body of Christ' (*Corpus Christi*, vi, 1). It is impossible to avoid observing the contrast between Catholic terminology of the fourth, and Anglican terminology of the twentieth, century.

[3] We must not forget that Optatus was an eye-witness of many of the scenes which he describes. He does not, however, wish to suggest that the angel's hand was seen, but simply to recall the fact that the vessel containing the Holy Chrism was uninjured by its fall. This he ascribes to the interposition of God, who uses His Angels to guard that which is His own, and to minister to the needs of His servants on earth. Mr. Sparrow Simpson (*id.*) comments on these events as follows: 'By these fanatical measures' [*sic*: one of which was throwing the Eucharist to dogs—the 'facinus inmane' of Optatus] 'the Separatists relieved their feelings [*sic*] and expressed their contempt. Various strange and legendary incidents recall the scandal to the Catholic sense of reverence.' History sometimes repeats herself with minute similarities. In Green's *History of the English People* (vol. ii, p. 186) we read that in the year 1539 'In one church a Protestant lawyer raised a dog in his hands when the Priest elevated the Host.'

You never could have done such things as these, if you had borne in mind the Commands of Christ, who has said :

'Give not that which is holy to dogs, and cast not your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turning rend you.' [1]

Could the makers of Unity have done anything of a like nature, out of which you might labour to create a baseless prejudice against us Catholics ? [2]

Urban of Forma and Felix of Idicra, when they came back, found that nuns whom they had seduced from their state of chastity had become mothers. Such, my brother Parmenian, is the character of the Bishops, whose deeds you cover up ; and, when you ought to be blushing for your own sins, you bring charges against innocent Catholics.

At this time the above-mentioned Bishop Felix, amongst his other crimes and horrible misdeeds, seized a young maiden to whom he himself had given the veil [3]—by whom he had a short time before been called by the name of Father—and did not hesitate in the least to be guilty of shameless incest. And, as if, through his sin, he had been made holy, he went with haste to Tysedis ! There he ventured to rob of the episcopal name and office and honour Donatus, a Bishop seventy years of age, against whom no charge could be brought. The Catholic Bishop was approached by the schismatic, the innocent by the

[1] Matt. vii, 6.

[2] *quid tale . . . fieri potuit, unde* etc. Du Pin, however, prints with a note of interrogation after *potuit*, and begins a fresh sentence with *Unde*.

[3] *cui ipse mitram imposuerat* (cf. vi, 4).

guilty, the priest of God by one steeped in sacrilege, the chaste by the incestuous. The Bishop was attacked by one no longer a Bishop, who, relying upon the decrees and conspiracy of your party, and armed by your laws and your commands, cast those hands which a short time before had been made heavy by sins, upon the head of the innocent, and dared to let judgement fall from that tongue of his, which was not now worthy even to be allowed to do penance. See, my brother Parmenian, the sort of persons whom you defend; see the kind of men they are, on whose behalf you have, this long while, maintained that the Endowments of the Church are working.

XX. It is proved against the Donatists, who call themselves saints, that no man can be free from sin.

Will you then—you who wish men to think you holy and innocent—tell me this—whence comes this sanctity of yours, which you too freely claim for yourselves—a sanctity which the Apostle John does not dare to profess, when he writes:

'If we shall say that we are without sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.'[1]

He who spoke thus kept himself, with wisdom, prepared for the grace of God.[2] For it belongs to a Christian man to will what is good, and to run the course which he has rightly willed. But it is not given to man to bring to perfection; so that after the stages, which a man can go, there remains something for God with which He may meet man's deficiency. For He alone is perfection; and perfect alone is Christ, the Son of

[1] 1 John i, 8.
[2] *sapienter se ad Dei gratiam reservavit.*

God. We, the others, are all half-perfect [1]; for it is ours to will,[2] it is ours to run, but it is God's to make perfect. So the most blessed Apostle Paul has written:

'It is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of him that reacheth to the grace of God.' [3]

For perfect sanctity has not been given, but promised, by Christ our Saviour. Thus He says:

'You shall be holy, because I am holy.' [4]

So that He alone is perfect and holy. He did not say 'You are holy' but He did say

'You shall be holy.'

With what reason then do you, in your pride, claim for yourselves perfect holiness, except it be to make it clear that you deceive yourselves, and that the truth is not in you?

You have been unwilling to live in the school of John,[5] for, when you lead some astray, you promise them that you will grant them forgiveness of their sins; and, when you are pleased to forgive sins, you

[1] *semi-perfecti* (and this only through the grace of God).

[2] If St. Optatus had lived after the Semi-Pelagian heresy, he would have expressed himself in a more guarded manner (cf. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes*, ii, 282). But we may be sure that he did not forget Philippians ii, 13: 'For it is God, who works in you both to will, and to make perfect.' St. John Chrysostom, who of course had never heard of Pelagianism, but was much concerned with the defence of free will against Manichaeism, uses such expressions as: 'We must first choose what is right and then God will do His part' (cf. *Hom. in Matt.* lxix, 2; *et in Matt.* xxxix, 4)—a phrase which St. Augustine would have repudiated at once.

[3] *neque volentis, neque currentis, sed ad Dei gratiam pertinentis.* The reference is of course to Rom. ix, 16. But here once again one suspects that St. Optatus is trusting to his memory, and quoting by heart. The Vulgate has not *ad Dei gratiam pertinentis*, but *miserentis Dei*. This is a literal translation of the Greek.

[4] Leviticus xi, 45.

[5] Cf. 1 John i, 8 (*supra*).

profess your own innocence and bestow forgiveness of sins, in such a manner as though you had no sin yourselves.[1] This in you is not presumption [merely]; it is deception. This is not truth; it is a falsehood.[2]

For it is only a moment after [3] you have laid your hands upon the heads of others and pardoned their crimes, that you turn to the altar, and are unable to pass over the Lord's Prayer. Then no doubt you say:

'Our Father who art in Heaven, forgive us our debts [4] and sins.'

What ought you to be called when you confess your own sins, if you are holy when you forgive the sins of others? In this way do you deceive yourselves, and the truth is not in you.

But it is clear that this is dictated to you by your nursing mother Pride, as Christ bears witness in the Gospel. Although He did not mention your names, still He pointed out your character by a parable. For thus has it been written:

'Jesus spoke this parable on account of those who consider themselves holy and despise others.' [5]

The evidence itself clearly shows that, when you puff yourselves up as holy, and plainly and openly despise us, this has been said of you. Two men, He

[1] It was the false boast of the Donatists that they could forgive the sins of other men, *because* they were themselves without sin.

[2] St. Optatus has already told us (cf. i, 10) that Parmenian had asserted that 'the unclean could not cleanse, nor the guilty grant pardon, nor could one who had been condemned absolve from sin.' He now retorts this argument: 'You absolve. On your own principles no sinner can absolve. Therefore you are forced to assert that you are without sin, but if you say that you are without sin, the truth is not in you.'

[3] *etenim inter vicina momenta.*

[4] *debita.* (Cf. iii, 4: 'debita etiam maxima perdere.')

[5] Luke xviii, 9 seq.

said, went up into the Temple to pray, one a Pharisee and the other a Publican. The Pharisee swollen out, proud, puffed up, such as we see you too to be, his body not humbled, his neck not bent, but with raised countenance and swelling breast—cried aloud :

'I give Thee thanks, my God, because in nothing have I sinned.'

This is to say to God :

'I have nothing for Thee to pardon.'

O wildness of a madman ! O pride that must be punished and condemned ![1] God is prepared to pardon and the guilty one hastens to reject forgiveness. The Publican in his humility, recognising that he was a man, besought in this manner :

'Have mercy, O Lord, on me a sinner.'

Thus did he[2] deserve to be justified ; thus did pride go down from the Temple, condemned in the Pharisee —your teacher.

More tolerable is it to find sins where there is humility, than innocence where there is pride.

But you, though you are burdened with the heavy sins of Betrayal and Schism, take credit to yourselves that you are proud as well !

XXI. The sin of the Donatists in stripping Bishops of their dignity and submitting them to Penance.

Now that we have proved that you ought to blush with shame for those things at which you rejoice, and have shown with what mad rage you conducted yourselves in so many places, something should be said about the depth of your impiety. For who

[1] *O insanus furor, o punienda et damnanda superbia !* For *O* RBvbd read *hoc.*

[2] Du Pin supplies *humilitas*, but it is not in the MSS.

ever will be able to explain the crimes that have been done, or those that are being actually done, by you? It is clear that, with a certain wicked ingenuity, you arranged all your plans in such a way as by one bad action to accomplish different results. For example, when a priest or a Bishop was removed by you from his post,[1] you saw to it that you might capture all his flock. How could a mass of men stand firm when they saw you tear their ruler from them? In this manner is it always that, after the shepherd has by some misfortune been killed, wolves set upon the sheep.

You exorcised the Faithful, and without reason washed the walls of the churches, that by wickedness of this kind you might undermine the minds of very simple people.[2] By such evil designs as these you throttled the intelligence of not a few,[3] and having disguised the light of your cunning by covering it all under a cloud[4] of feigned simplicity, you shot arrows from your quiver, to lay low the miserable by the seductions that your hearts contrived. Even as the Holy Ghost foretold of you, through David the Prophet, in the Psalm:

> 'For lo the wicked have bent their bow, they have prepared the arrows in their quiver to shoot the upright of heart when the moon is dark.'[5]

[1] *dum . . . deicitur.* Ziwsa says that *deicitur* here = *a loco removetur.*

[2] When the Donatists seized the churches of the Catholics, they washed down their walls, with grotesque and superstitious ceremonies, thus to impress upon the minds of the ignorant people that the very material buildings had been profaned by Catholic worship (cf. vi, 6).

[3] *nonnullorum animi iugulati sunt.*

[4] *sub nube*, with reference to 'obscura luna' (in the quotation from Psalm x, that follows immediately).

[5] Ps. x, 3: *ad sagittandos obscura luna* (Vulgate *ut sagittent in obscura*).

In what way have your deeds fallen short of your plans? You have shot the innocent, you have disarmed the faithful. Bishops have been stripped of the office belonging to their title. O unheard-of impiety, upon whom have you laid your cut-throat hands, to keep them amongst the torments of Penance [1]?

The savagery of highway robbers is seen to be a thing of less account, when compared with the deeds that you have done. The robber gives those whom he murders a quick death; you slay your victim, yet leave him amongst the living.[2] Those whom you have succeeded in deceiving have been entrapped through the weakness of their understanding,[3] for they [4] who had been ordained in the Name of God had, by God's own work, been made perfect [in their office]. And you fight fiercely against the work of God, destroying His work by the engines of your wickedness.[5]

It is clear, therefore, that of you it has been written in the tenth Psalm:

'That which Thou hast made perfect they have destroyed.' [6]

Your impiety has filled you with pride, but

'Justice looking down from heaven' [7]

accuses you; whilst on earth men praise you with

[1] *inter Poenitentiae tormenta servare.*

[2] You strip the Catholic Bishops of their office and make them endure a living death amongst those doing Penance.

[3] *paupertate sensus sui,* id est 'You have made simple people believe, contrary to the truth, that their Bishops were unworthy.'

[4] *illi* = the Bishops.

[5] *malitiae vectibus.*

[6] Ps. x, 4. [7] Cf. Ps. lxxxiv, 12.

mistaken praise for doing wickedness, so that of you the Holy Ghost has said in the ninth Psalm :

> 'Whilst the wicked man is proud, the poor man is set on fire ; they are caught in the counsels which they devise. The sinner is praised in the desires of his soul and he who does iniquity shall be blessed.' [1]

What greater iniquity than yours can there be found to be praised ? What is there more iniquitous than to exorcise the Holy Ghost, to break down altars, to cast the Eucharist to animals ? Yet your people praise you and—thus do they plunge you into folly—call you fortunate, and name you for good luck,[2] and swear by your name, and so are seen already to treat your persons as though you were God.

XXII. The Impiety of the Donatists, who were accustomed to swear by their Bishops.

Men are accustomed to use the Name of God when they swear, as a pledge of their truthfulness, but your party, when they swear by you, keep silence about God and Christ. If the worship due to God has passed from Heaven to you (as would seem from the fact that men swear by you), then let none of you or your party fall sick ! Then refuse to die ; give orders to the clouds : draw down the rain, if you can, that they may swear even more freely in your name, and may keep silence about God. For what could the Devil effect more by the hands of your people, than he did in the ages that are past, when

[1] Ps. ix, 23, 24. Verse 23 is only found in PG (in P in a corrupt form—'dum superbium pius . . . conpraehenditur in consiliis quae cogitat' ; it is corrected in G).

[2] *bene nominant.*

he caused his temples to be built and his idols to be fashioned—excepting this, that silence should be kept about God, whilst men in their foolishness speak of him alone.

XXIII. The wickedness of the Donatists in scraping the heads of anointed priests.

O sacrilege heaped upon impiety! You gladly listen to men swearing by you, but refuse your ears to the voice of God in the hundred and fourth Psalm, when He says:

'Touch not Mine Anointed and cast not your hands on My prophets.'[1]

That both kings and priests are God's Anointed is shown by the books of Kings and also by David, saying in the hundred and thirty-second Psalm:

'As the precious ointment on the head, that ran down unto the beard of Aaron.'[2]

You, on the contrary, have striven against God to despise His precepts, as earnestly as they who fear God strive to keep His Commandments. Tell us, where is your authority for scraping the heads of priests,[3] when there are so many examples to the contrary, showing that this may not be done?

[1] Ps. civ, 15: *Ne tetigeritis unctos Meos, neque in prophetas Meos manum miseritis.* The Vulgate reads: *in prophetas Meos nolite malignari.*

[2] Ps. cxxxii, 2.

[3] *ubi vobis mandatum est radere capita sacerdotum?* This is really important. From this passage in Optatus it is plain that the Donatist sacrilege was no other than the wrongful use of the Rite of Degradation as it is now prescribed in the Roman Pontifical. 'Cum cultello aut vitro *abradit* leviter caput degradandi dicens: Consecrationem et benedictionem atque *unctionem* tibi traditam *radendo* delemus.' So Optatus, with special reference to an unction

Saul, before he sinned, received the grace of being anointed.[1] After his anointing, he sinned grievously. God, when He saw this, wishing to give us an example

bestowed upon priests, here accuses the Donatists of scraping the heads of the Catholic priests whom, without any regard for the sanctity of the Holy Oil, they ventured to degrade. (Cf. ii, 25 *ad fin.* : ' oleum suum defendit Deus,' etc.)

But until now no one seems ever to have imagined that oil was used in any part of the Catholic world either in the ordination of priests or the consecration of Bishops until the sixth century. Thus Duchesne writes (*Origines du culte*, x, *ad fin.*) : ' *L'onction propre au rit Gallican* aura été suggérée par l'Ancien Testament. Elle ne paraît pas très ancienne. Quelques indices porteraient à en chercher l'origine dans les Eglises de Bretagne [in fact Gildas alludes to it] qui la pratiquaient dès le sixième siècle.' Similarly the learned Dr. Hatch writes as follows (Article on *Ordination* in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*) :—' This rite [anointing of the hands of priests] is mentioned by two French liturgical writers of the ninth century, Amalarius of Metz (837) and Theodulphus of Orleans (821) ; the earliest canonist who speaks of it is Burchard of Worms (1025), but the recognised body of canon law distinctly disallows it, quoting a response of Pope Nicholas I to the Archbishop of Bourges in 864, who says that it is not a custom of the Roman Church, and that he has never heard of its being practised in the Christian Church. This must be held conclusive, at any rate as to its not being a general practice in the ninth century ; but afterwards it no doubt became general, for Innocent III insists upon it, and objects to the Greeks for their omission of it. It is important to note that even the Pseudo-Isidorian authorities for the rite refer only to Bishops ; at the same time they clearly show that the origin of the rite was the growing tendency to institute an analogy of ceremonies between the Old and New Testament.' Dr. Hatch proceeds to remark :—' In addition to the anointing of the hands a group of English and Norman pontificals direct the anointing of the head ; so Pontif. Ecgb., S. Dunstan, Caturic., Rotom., Becc., *but not elsewhere.*' In contradiction to this we see clearly from St. Optatus that the heads of Bishops and probably of priests (the word *Sacerdotum* here—as we may judge from the context—probably includes *Presbyteri* as well as *Episcopi*) were universally anointed in Africa in the fourth century (cf. ii, 25 : ' Ne tetigeritis, inquit, unctos meos ').

[1] *ungi meruit.*

not to touch the Oil, professed His repentance. For we read that the Lord spoke thus :

'It repenteth Me to have anointed Saul to be a king.'[1]

Yet surely God might have taken away the Oil which He had bestowed ; but, since He wished to teach that the Oil should not be touched even in a sinner, He who had given it, declared that it repented Him. If then God, in order to teach you, could not (because He would not) take away that which He had given, who are you to take away what you did not give ?

And when you ought to have opened your ears to listen, you prepared your razor for sin. When you ought to have been the sons of God, you preferred to be the sons of men, and, in order to bite into other men's offices, turned your teeth into arrows and arms. You sharpened your tongues into swords ; you fulfilled that which was written of you in the fifty-sixth Psalm :

'Sons of men—their teeth are arms and arrows ; their tongue is a sharp sword.'[2]

XXIV. The wrong done by the Donatists to men of every degree and age by laying hands upon them in Penance.

So you have sharpened your tongues into swords with which you slew not the bodies of men, but their dignities ; you have destroyed not their members, but their titles. What boots it for those to live, who have been slain by you in their office ? Their members are indeed whole and sound, but they carry about the corpse of the dignity which you have scratched away. For you stretched forth your hand and placed the death-bearing Veils upon every head ; so that

[1] 1 Kings xv, 11. [2] Ps. lvi, 5.

whilst there are (as I have said above) four kinds of heads in the Church—Bishops, priests, deacons, and the Faithful, you have not spared one.

You have overturned the souls of men.[1] God holds these actions of yours up to detestation in Ezekiel the Prophet, when He says :

'Woe to you who make a Veil,'[2]

that is, who place your hands

'upon every head[3] and upon every age, to overturn souls.'

You have found boys, you have wounded them with Penance, so that none of them might be ordained.

Recognise that you have 'overturned souls.'

You have found old men amongst the Faithful,[4] you have made them do Penance.

Recognise that you have 'overturned souls.'

You have found deacons, priests, Bishops, you have made them as laymen.

Recognise that you have 'overturned souls.'

He, upon whose head thou hast now endeavoured to lay thine hands,[5] had, for a long time, been thy fellow and companion.[6] You were once wont to run together.[7] Guilty he was not—but let us assume his guilt.

[1] *hominum*. Ziwsa writes '*omnium* non inepte anonymus quidam apud Du Pin proposuit.' Casaubon adopts Du Pin's suggestion.

[2] *velum facientibus*, Ez. xiii, 18.

[3] *super omne caput*. These words are not to be found here in RBvbd ; but they are in all the MSS. in i, 2, where St. Optatus quotes the same passage from Ezekiel.

[4] *invenistis fideles antiquos*. Ziwsa says that *antiquos* here = *seniores*.

[5] in Penance.

[6] In the Episcopate.

[7] *pariter currebatis*.

In that case, as thou thinkest, he has fallen. See then (if thou hast read the Apostle) to Whom thou dost stand, and let him see, to Whom he has fallen. If thou art a servant, recognise thy Lord, and understand that he who, a short time ago, ran together with thee, to thee has not fallen. Why dost thou invade Another's power, why dost thou in thy rashness ascend the tribunal of God? And though thyself art guilty, darest to pass judgement upon another? Yet thou hast read:

'He who stands, stands to his own Lord, and who falls, to his own Lord he falls. But his Lord is powerful to raise him up.'[1]

Who then art thou to judge Another's servant?

That you[2] have no right to touch the Oil bestowed by God upon a Bishop, you ought to have learnt from David the servant of God, who was anointed by Samuel, with the condition that what had already been given to Saul, should by no means be taken away.[3] When, through the command, or the providence, of God, they were shut up together in one cave, Saul, who had sinned, came into the power of the youth David. Saul, although he sees not, is seen, because (as usually happens to one that passes from the light of day) he was not able, in the darkness of the shut-in-air,[4] to see the other who was near him. A great

[1] Rom. xiv, 4.

[2] St. Optatus now passes abruptly back from the singular to the plural number and refers to the whole Donatist party.

[3] Cf. 1 Kings xxiv.

[4] *in caligine clausi aeris*. So the MSS. An ingenious suggestion is *antri* for *aeris*. Barthius suggests *oris*, meaning that Saul's face was in the darkness. Casaubon seems inclined to accept *oris*, but will not admit that *oris* can mean *face*. He understands *oris speluncae* (the mouth of the cave).

army followed the old king. Still he had fallen into the power of another. David had the chance of victory in his hands. Without effort he might have slain his incautious adversary who was wrapt in security. Without bloodshed, and the clash of arms, he might have summarily changed war into slaughter. The opportunity was there. His soldiers were in favour of this course. The situation urged him on to snatch a victory. Already he commenced to draw his sword. His armed hand was now reaching for his enemy's throat. But the remembrance of the divine commands completely blocked the way. He fought against the persuasion of his soldiers, and resisted the fitness of the circumstances, as if he had said :

'To no purpose, O Victory, dost thou tempt me ; in vain, O opportunity, dost thou lure me on to triumphs ! '

He wished to conquer his foe, but desired even more to keep the commands of the Lord.

'I will not,' he said, 'lay my hands upon the Lord's anointed.' [1]

He checked his hand and his sword—he feared to violate the Oil ; he saved his enemy ; and, that he might accomplish his duty towards his King to the end, after his death took up his defence.[2]

You neither fear God, nor regard those who are your brethren. You have sharpened the razors of your tongue upon the whetstone of your malice,

[1] 1 Kings xxiv, 7. RBvd omit the *non*. According to this reading it becomes a question : 'Shall I lay my hands ? etc.'

[2] Cf. 2 Kings i.

and, trampling underfoot the precepts of Heaven, have rushed upon the heads of miserable men, that, after you had slain their leaders, you might drag them in their blindness and ignorance into bondage. You hunger after the dignities of innocent priests, with a hunger so furious that you have made open sepulchres of your throats. For each separate sepulchre one funeral is enough, and then it is closed. For your throats many funerals of many dignities have not by any means been enough. They still remain open, seeking whom they may devour. So that with reason was it said of you :

'Their throat is an open sepulchre' ;[1]

for with cursing you are beforehand, though it has been written :

'Bless ye and curse not.'[2]

If any man has done anything against your will, you threaten him with horrors and foul menaces ; and then, since some there are who deserve more evil than good, you attribute to your bitter curses whatever has befallen them from the Judgement of God, or is the just result of their sins. With reason was it said of you in the thirteenth Psalm :

'Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.'[3]

You boast that some men have been known to die after you have cursed them.

It is certain that it is not lawful to kill. On this account do you hold yourselves innocent, merely

[1] Pss. v, 11 and xiii, 3. [2] Rom. xii, 14. [3] Ps. xiii, 3.

because you have not used cold steel? If there be no murder without steel, the poisoner, also, may judge himself to be innocent; and a man need not deem himself guilty who has killed another by withdrawing his food; he also, then, may claim to be guiltless who smothers his victim—still clinging to life—by stifling his breath. Of murders there are many kinds, but the name of Death is one. Thou dost declare with confidence that a man has died through thy curses. What difference does it make whether thou smitest him with the sword, or dost strike him with the tongue? Beyond doubt thou art a murderer, if a man, who was alive, has met his death through thee.

Whoever of thy party has thus acted professes in vain that he is a Christian, or a priest of God, for he takes no care to imitate the Mildness of God, though it is written in Solomon [1]:

'God hath not made death, nor doth He rejoice in the destruction of the living.' [2]

I do not believe that you are able to forget the crimes that you have committed throughout several districts, where you set to work to slay those who were preaching the Law of God, that is to say, His Prophets, contrary to His command, who says:

'Lay not your hands upon My Prophets.' [3]

Deuterius, Partenius, Donatus and Getulicus, Bishops of God, you slew with the sword of your tongue.

[1] *in Salomone*, omitted by Pb.

[2] Wisdom i, 13. We may note that St. Optatus here (as in iv, 8) quotes the Book of Wisdom as canonical Scripture.

[3] Ps. civ, 15.

You shed the blood, not of their body, but of their dignity. Afterwards they still lived, but were slain by you in their dignities—they who were Priests of God.

It is known to many (and has been proved) that in the time of persecution some Bishops fell away through cowardice from the confession of the Name of God, and offered incense to idols. But never did any one of those who remained faithful either place his hand [in Penance] upon the fallen, or command them to bend their knees [1] [as penitents]. Yet you to-day do to those who preserved Unity [2] that which was never done by any man to those who offered incense to idols.[3] For it has been written :

'Touch not Mine Anointed, and lay not your hand upon My prophets.'

God avenges the Oil which is His own, for the sin belongs to man, but the unction to God. 'Touch not,' He says, 'Mine Anointed,' in order that when the sin of man is punished, the Oil, which is God's, be subjected to no indignity.[4] God has reserved to His own Judgement that which is His own, but you everywhere rush upon that which is Another's, and destroy the happiness of all. For, what greater unhappiness, than for priests of God to live, and not be what they once had been ?

XXVI. Matrons, boys and virgins were compelled by the Donatists to do Penance.

Matrons, together with boys and virgins, although they had committed no sin, were compelled by you to

[1] *ut genua figerent.* A rite belonging to Public Penance. Cf. Tertullian *de Poen.* ix.

[2] *post unitatem.* [3] *post turificationem.*

[4] *ne . . . Oleum, quod Dei est, feriatur.*

learn to do Penance, with you for their instructors, whilst they still remained in possession of their innocence and modesty. Is this a small unhappiness? You have destroyed both sexes; you have harassed all ages. Truly of you has it been said in the thirteenth Psalm:

'Destruction and unhappiness are in their ways, and the way of peace they have not known, the fear of God is not before their eyes.'[1]

You have prescribed Penance for the people. It was not performed voluntarily by any man, but it was enforced by you, nor did you inflict it equally, for the same periods of time, but arranged everything with respect of persons. By your command one person did Penance for a whole year, another for a month, yet another for hardly a day.

If to consent to unity is (as you will have it) a sin, if it is the same fault in all, why is there not the same Penance for the same guilt?

There is no doubt that the people who believe have been called Israel, and that the Faithful, one by one, are the daughters of Israel, that is, those who see God with their mind,[2] and have faith in God. Yet you

[1] Ps. xiii, 3.

[2] *Id est qui mente Deum viderint.* St. Jerome tells us that it was commonly thought in his time that Israel signifies *vir videns Deum.* Great names can be quoted for this opinion, and we see in the text that it was taken for granted by St. Optatus. It persisted even to the days of St. Bernard (cf. *serm.* 5 *ad Fest. Omnium Sanctorum*), notwithstanding the fact that it had been rejected by St. Jerome (*Liber Hebraic. Quaestionum in Genesim*, 357)—and rightly, not only on etymological grounds, but also as being opposed to the words of Scripture, which he quotes in his text as follows:—'Vocabitur nomen tuum Israel, quia invaluisti cum Deo, et cum

have compelled these people to bend and incline their necks, have joined their heads in a row, and made of them a crowd of penitents.

These are the Faithful over whom God grieves, saying, by the mouth of Ezekiel the Prophet: 'Woe to you, daughters of Israel who mend pillows,'[1] appurtenances of the neck, to place them under the elbow and under the hand—that is, under your elbows and under your hands, when you stretch the veils of Penance over the heads of these men and women.

The extent of your wickedness and rage I have now set forth, and I have pointed out your pride.

It remains to make clear your folly also, but this I will do in my Sixth Book.

hominibus valebis' (Gen. xxxiii, 28). The mistake probably arose from the next verse but one:—'Vocavitque Jacob nomen loci illius Phanuel dicens: Vidi Deum facie ad faciem.' St. Jerome understands *Israel* to mean 'Prince with God' (Princeps cum Deo). It seems, however, more likely that the true meaning is 'One who wrestled with God.' (From Hebrew *Sarâh* = to fight, to strive, and *El* = God.) Thus the LXX ὅτι ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ Θεοῦ. And this sense is in harmony with the context. The late Professor Driver (see Article on *Jacob* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii, p. 530) writes: 'The name Israel, meaning (on the analogy of other names similarly formed) God persists (or perseveres), is interpreted as suggesting the meaning Perseverer with God.' Professor Driver also tells us that Professor 'Sayce's derivation from *yāshar*, to be upright, to direct (!), has nothing to recommend it.' (The note of exclamation is Driver's.)

[1] *Vae filiabus Israel, quae sarciunt cervicalia.* We have here another mystical reference to Ez. xiii, 18 which runs as follows in the Vulgate: 'Vae quae consuunt pulvillos sub omni cubito manus; et faciunt cervicalia sub capite universae aetatis ad capiendas animas: et cum caperent animas populi Mei, vivificabant animas eorum.'

## BOOK THE THIRD

THE FOUR REASONS ON ACCOUNT OF WHICH IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO BRING ABOUT UNITY WITHOUT SEVERITY.

BECAUSE THE SCHISMATICS HAD BUILT CHURCHES 'THAT WERE NOT WANTED.'

BECAUSE DONATUS OF CARTHAGE HAD APPEALED TO THE EMPEROR TO BRING ABOUT UNITY.

BECAUSE DONATUS OF BAGAIA COLLECTED BANDS OF ARMED MEN TO STOP THE WORK OF UNITY.

BECAUSE NONE OF THOSE THINGS WITH WHICH THE WORK OF UNITY HAS BEEN REPROACHED CAME TO PASS IN OPPOSITION TO THE WILL OF GOD.

I. The severities against the Donatists were provoked by themselves, and Catholics ought not to be blamed for them.

I HAVE written in my second Book (as I think, at sufficient length) concerning the Church, which is the Bride of Christ, and about her Endowments, and of the Saviour's inheritance. It remains for me to show, in the first place, the errors of the schismatics; secondly, to point out how it came to pass that unity was enforced; and thirdly, to prove who brought it about that an armed force was sent.

That much severity was shown by the makers of unity cannot be denied. But why impute this to

Leontius, Macarius or Taurinus [1]? Ascribe it rather to your own ancestors, who, as the prophet has written, 'have themselves eaten sour grapes, that your teeth may be set on edge.' [2]

They are primarily responsible, who divided the people of God and built basilicas which were not wanted.[3]

Secondly, Donatus of Carthage ought to be blamed, for it was in consequence of his appeal [4] that an attempt was made to enforce unity at the next opportunity.

Thirdly, Donatus of Bagaia, who got together a mob of madmen, so that Macarius asked for the help of an armed force, in order to protect himself and the interests which had been committed to his care.

Then came armed men 'with their quivers,' [5] and 'every town was filled with those who shout.' [6] Unity

[1] We find the names of Ursacius and Paulus joined to those of Macarius and Leontius in iii, 4. (Cf. also iii, 10, and for Taurinus iii, 4; iii, 12.)

[2] Jeremiah xxi, 29: 'ut vobis stupescerent dentes, ipsi uvas acidas comederunt.' The Vulgate has: 'Patres comederunt uvam acerbam et dentes filiorum obstupuerunt.'

[3] *Basilicas non necessarias.* We find this expression many times in Optatus. It is first used by him in i, 10, where the churches of heretics are said to have no relationship with Christ and are contrasted with His lawful Bride. Elsewhere it is a technical phrase and means simply that the Donatist churches are 'not wanted.' It evidently is a quotation—probably from a judgement, either of Miltiades or of Arles—or possibly the words were those of Eunomius and Olimpius (i, 26). The Donatists erected new churches, refusing to go to the old ones. There is no doubt a *μείωσις*. The intention of the inventor of the expression was to avoid hurting the feelings of the Donatists by calling their new churches schismatical. They are simply *non necessariae*—'not wanted.'

[4] *qui provocavit*—to the Emperor—to his horror (cf. Appendix, pp. 393, 396, 397).

[5] Cf. Is. xxii, 6: *et Elam sumpsit pharetram.*

[6] *repleta est unaquaeque civitas vociferantium.* St. Optatus in

was proclaimed, and you all 'took to flight.'[1] To no man was it said 'Deny God'; to none was the commandment given 'Burn the Scriptures'; to none was it said 'Place incense in the censer'; or 'Pull down the basilicas.' These are the commands which give birth to martyrs. Unity was proclaimed. There were merely exhortations that the people should assemble in one place, to pray together to God and His Christ. At first there were no threats[2]; no one had seen a weapon or a prison; there were, as I have said, exhortations merely. Yet you were all filled with fear; you fled; you trembled—so that which has been written in the fifty-second Psalm was certainly said of you:

> 'They trembled for fear where there was no fear.'[3]

Then all your Bishops, with their clergy, 'took to flight.' Some died. The 'more hardy' were 'captured and banished to a distance.'[4]

II. These things happened to the Donatists through the just punishment of God.

Still, none of these things was done at our instigation, none by our advice, none with our privity, none by our aid. They were all done through the grief of God,[5] (who grieved bitterly,[6]) to punish your sin against

his next chapter thus quotes Is. xxii, 2. Du Pin must have forgotten this when, without MS. authority, he supplied *clamoribus* after *vociferantium*.

[1] Is. xxii, 3. [2] *terror* (in active sense).

[3] Ps. lii, 6.

[4] *qui fortiores sunt* etc. Cf. Is. xxii, 3—quoted thus in the next chapter: 'Omnes principes tui *in fugam conversi sunt*, et qui *capti* sunt graviter alligati et *fortiores* tui *longe fugati sunt*.'

[5] *in dolore Dei*. Cf. iv, 9 (quod dolet Deus) and i, 2.

[6] Is. xxii, 4. St. Optatus has led up to this quotation by his various references to this chapter of Isaiah.

the water of Baptism which, contrary to His command, you had moved a second time,[1] drawing to yourselves,[2] as it were, the water of the ancient pool.[3] I know not whether it contained that Fish by which is understood Christ,[4] the Fish captured, as we read in the book of the Patriarch Tobias—captured in the River Tigris, of which the gall and the liver were taken by [young] Tobias as a protection for his wife Sara, and to give sight to his father in his blindness—that Fish through the entrails of which [5] Asmodeus,[6] the devil, was put to flight by Sara the maiden (by whom is understood the Church), and blindness was removed from Tobias.[7] This is that Fish, which in Baptism, through the

[1] By rebaptising Catholics.

[2] *transducentes ad vos aquam antiquae piscinae.* Cf. Is. xxii, 9, which St. Optatus will soon quote from his version: 'Quoniam convertistis aquam antiquae piscinae ad civitatem vestram.'

[3] The reference is to the pool of Bethsaida (cf. John v, 4), the waters of which were regarded by Tertullian as typical of Baptism (*De Baptism.* v and vi). The Angel was only allowed to move the pool *once* each time for healing. Optatus looks upon this fact as a figure of the unity of Baptism.

[4] The metaphor here is slightly changed. The 'piscina' is understood as a lake full of fish. St. Optatus asks sarcastically whether Christ was in that lake, meaning that the sacrilegious rebaptisms of the Donatists, in this unlike True Baptism, gave Christ to no man. It is well known, of course, that the Fish was a principal emblem of Christ among the early Christians.

[5] *eiusdem piscis visceribus.*

[6] Cf. *Paradise Lost,* iv, 168–170:

'Than Asmodeus, with the fishy fume
That drove him, though enamoured, from the spouse
Of Tobit's son.'

[7] See Tobias vi, 9–10. St. Optatus mystically applies this narrative. Sara is the Church which puts the Evil One to flight through Christ. Christ is the one protection of His Church; by Christ alone, through His Church, is blindness removed from men.

Invocation of God,[1] is placed in the waters of the font, so that what had been water is, from the Fish,[2] also called '*piscina*.'

This is that Fish, the name of which in Greek contains in its one name alone, through each of its letters, a number of holy names, ΙΧΘΥΣ, that is to say in Latin, *Iesus Christus, Dei Filius, Salvator—Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour.*[3] This 'piscina,' which in the whole Catholic Church throughout the world is joyfully filled with saving waters for the life of the human race, you have drawn away[4] according to your own wills; and have made null that one only Baptism[5] (through which walls have been built up for the protection of men[6]), and have made as it were other walls,[7] building

[1] *per invocationem.* The Invocation of God, that is to say, the Blessing of the Font, puts Christ (the Fish) into what was mere empty water, so that it becomes a Fishpond. But in the second Baptism of the Donatists there was no Christ, therefore no symbolic Fish.

[2] *a pisce.*

[3] Cf. Tertullian (*De Baptismo* i): 'Sed nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθυν nostrum Iesum Christum in quo nascimur, *nec aliter quam in aqua permanendo* salvi sumus.'

[4] *transduxistis* once more. Cf. Is. xxii, 9.

[5] *solvistis singulare Baptisma.*

[6] *ex quo Baptismate hominibus muri facti sunt ad tutelam.* The reference is to Is. xxii, 11, 12: 'Et *deicistis muros* Hierusalem, ut faceretis alteram munitionem et constituistis aquam *inter duas munitiones* et ad piscinam antiquam (= the first—the Catholic Baptism) adtendere noluistis.' The thought of St. Optatus is that the Donatists by rebaptising pulled down the first wall and built up a second (*alteros muros, duas munitiones*). This was to build an edifice on a ruin. Hence, as he will say immediately, comes the sorrow of God *filiam esse contritam.* ('Recedite a Me, amare flebo. Nolite incumbere ut consolemini Me super vastitate filiae populi Mei.' Is. xxii, 4. Vulgate.)

[7] Cf. iii. 10: 'foras exeuntes . . . parietem fecerunt,' etc.

an unworthy building, since you have not been able to build up without throwing down.

And what kind of building can that be which is built out of a ruin ? [1] This it is over which God grieves and weeps, through the prophet Isaiah,[2] saying that the daughter of His people (*generis*) was laid low. For it is the *genus* of God to have no *genus*.[3] He is of Himself,[4] and He remaineth for ever. And like to Him in this is the water, of which we do not read that it was created.[5] To avenge the injury done to this water,[6] God points out His Tears, which you have caused Him. These He declares can be dried by no consolation, addressing you by Isaiah His prophet :

> ' Depart from me, I will weep bitterly. No one will be able to comfort me, for the laying low of the daughter of my people.' [7]

In this passage our innocence is defended, whilst God with grief makes clear His wrath against you, giving the cause and alleging the reason.

Besides, He does not say ' in Sion,' [8] for it is not

[1] Cf. iii, 10.

[2] Cf. Is. xxii, 4.

[3] We here have another ' paronomasia ' or play upon words, of which St. Optatus, like many of the Fathers, was so fond.

[4] *ex se est.*

[5] The reference is to the description of the Creation of the World in Genesis, where we read : ' The Spirit of God was borne over the waters,' without any account of the creation of the waters themselves.

[6] *in cuius aquae iniuria.*

[7] Isaiah xxii, 4 : ' Missum Me facite, amare plorabo : nemo poterit consolare Me in contritione filiae generis Mei.' The Vulgate has ' vastatione ' for ' contritione.'

[8] St. Optatus is continuing his argument from Isaiah xxii, where, instead of *The Burden of the Valley of the Vision*, he evidently read

in the whole of Sion,[1] but only in its valley[2] that judgements were delivered. Not that Mount Sion which in Syrian Palestine is separated by only a small river from the walls of Jerusalem,[3] on the summit of which there is not the great plain, on which were [4] the seven synagogues, whither the Jewish people might assemble and learn the law given to Moses—but where no law-suits were heard and no judgements were given by any, for it was a place of teaching, not of controversial discussion. (If anything of this sort had to be done, it was done within the walls of Jerusalem.) Therefore was it written in Isaiah the prophet :

> ' The Law shall go forth from Sion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.' [5]

*The Vision of the Valley of Sion.* St. Jerome tells us that the LXX had *Verbum Vallis Sionis* for *Onus Vallis Visionis.* Optatus' point here is that the subject of this prophecy is not the actual Mount Sion, but the spiritual Sion, which is the Catholic Church. (In v, 4 he writes : ' Sion Ecclesiam esse in tertio libro probavimus.')

[1] *In tota Sion.* Only G has *tota,* but it seems to have probably slipped out of the older MSS., as a little later Optatus has *in toto monte.*

[2] Is. xxii, 5. Vulgate *In valle* visionis.

[3] We have here a digression which shows, and probably was intended to show, St. Optatus' acquaintance with the topography of Jerusalem. Sion was outside of Jerusalem. We read as follows in the narrative of a Bordeaux pilgrim to the Holy Land, to be found in *Itinera Hierosolymitana* (*CSEL.* vol. 29, p. 22) : ' Item *exeuntibus* Hierusalem ut ascendas Sion, in parte sinistra et deorsum in Valle iuxta *murum* est *piscina,* quae dicitur Silua [i.e. Siloe] . . . Intus autem intra murum Sion paret locus, ubi palatium habuit David. Et *septem synagogae, quae illic fuerunt,* una tantum remansit, reliquae autem arantur et seminantur, sicut Isaias propheta dixit.'

[4] *fuerant.* The Bordeaux pilgrim, whom I have just quoted, wrote in 333, about thirty years before St. Optatus. Nothing else seems to be known concerning these seven synagogues.

[5] Is. ii, 3. The topographical digression finishes with this quotation.

It was not therefore on this Mount Sion that Isaiah beheld the valley, but on the holy mountain, that is the Church, which has reared her head throughout all the Roman world, beneath the whole expanse of Heaven.

This is the mountain on which the Son of God rejoices that He is made King by God the Father, saying:

'That He hath made me King upon His holy hill of Sion'[1]—

that is, over the Church, of which He is King and Spouse and Head—not on the hill [in Palestine],[2] where there were no gates beloved by God, but on the mount, by which the Church is spiritually signified. The gates of this Church are entered by the innocent, the just and the merciful, by the pure of heart, and the virgins. These are the gates of which the Holy Ghost makes mention, through David, in the eighty-sixth Psalm, when He says:

'Her foundations are upon the holy hills; the Lord loveth the Gates of Sion'[3]—

not the gates of that material mountain,[4] where now, after the triumphs of the Emperor Vespasian, there are no gates, and scarce any traces of its ancient ruins are to be found.

Wherefore, the spiritual Sion is the Church, in which Christ was made King by God the Father—that is in the whole world, where there is One Catholic Church

[1] Psalm ii, 6.
[2] The material hill.
[3] Psalm lxxxvi, 1.
[4] *non illius corporalis montis.*

. . . for the most holy prophet David bears witness in another place also that Sion is the Church :

'Laud thy God, O Sion, for he hath made fast the bars of thy gates. He hath blessed thy children within thee.'[1]

We understand the various provinces of the whole world to represent the various valleys of the mountain.[2] And since Isaiah had not his vision of the whole mountain, but of one valley, that means in Africa alone, for in Africa alone your fathers were pleased to build fresh temples, although the first were amply sufficient. In Africa alone walls were cast down, and in order that walls might be made[3] the water of the holy font was turned to a wrong purpose, and novelty was introduced by you against antiquity, and water of human origin was provided, against that which is divine.[4]

[1] Psalm cxlvii, 1, 2.

[2] *per singulas provincias totius orbis valles singulas intellegimus montis.* Casaubon suggests that St. Optatus wrote this by a slip of the pen instead of *per singulas valles montis intellegimus singulas provincias totius orbis.* As an alternative he conjectures that we should read *praeterea* for *per.* But surely St. Optatus may have thought it more elegant to write it as the MSS. give it. 'By the provinces we understand the valleys.'

[3] *in qua sola deiecti sunt muri et, ut fierent muri, aqua sanctae piscinae transversa est.* Ziwsa brackets *ut fierent muri,* which is omitted by RBGv, evidently regarding it as incomprehensible. But it represents 'ut faceretis alteram munitionem' in Optatus' version of Is. xxii, 20. RBv have *aqua sancta et piscina* for *aqua sanctae piscinae.* The reference is still to the rebaptism by Donatists. They who were already Christians were, by an impious novelty, rebaptised, that they might become Christians. (Cf. v, 3 : 'Qui rebaptizatur, iam Christianus fuerat; quomodo dici potest iterum Christianus ?')

[4] '*In una valle, hoc est sola Africa, in qua sola, cum sufficerent templa Dei, quae fuerant, alia facere voluerunt principes vestri, in qua sola deiecti sunt muri, et, ut fierent muri, aqua sanctae piscinae trans-*

Chiding the valley of Sion, God challenges all this,[1] demanding[2]:

'What aileth you that you have gone up into superfluous temples? Every city is full of those who clamour. Their wounded were not wounded by the sword, and those who are dead in thee are not dead in battle. From the smallest to the greatest all thy princes are in error, wandering upon the hills.[3] They have been turned to flight, and those who have been taken have been grievously bound.[4] And thy strong ones have been put to flight to a far distance. Let me go, for I will weep bitterly. No one will be able to

*versa est, et novitas contra antiquitatem a vobis instituta est, et aqua humana contra divinam ordinata est'* (cf. v, 3 etc.). By *aqua humana* is meant water used by rebaptisers. By *aqua divina* is meant the water used in Baptism, which, in accordance with Catholic doctrine, is one, and once for all. This is a sort of summing up in which St. Optatus endeavours, with considerable ingenuity, to show once more that Is. xxii, 1–11 has reference to the Donatists. We shall perhaps see this more clearly if we place his words in juxtaposition with his Latin version of Isaiah, which he knew to be familiar to his readers.

| *St. Optatus.* | *Isaias.* |
|---|---|
| *Cum sufficerent templa Dei, alia facere voluerunt* | = 'Ascendistis in templa supervacanea.' |
| *Principes vestri* | = 'Omnes principes tui.' |
| *In qua sola deiecti sunt muri* | = 'Deiicistis muros Hierusalem.' |
| *Ut fierent muri* | = 'Ut faceretis alteram munitionem . . . inter duas munitiones.' |
| *Aqua sanctae piscinae transversa est* | = 'Convertistis aquam antiquae piscinae.' |
| *Novitas contra antiquitatem* | = 'Ad piscinam antiquam adtendere noluistis.' |
| *Aqua humana contra divinam* | = 'Nec ad Eum . . . qui creavit illam.' |

[1] *hoc totum interrogat.*
[2] Is. xxii, 1.
[3] *errore sunt . . . errantes in montibus.*
[4] *graviter adligati.*

console me for the devastation of the daughter of my people. And the Elamites [1] shall come up with their quivers.'

Elamites in the Latin tongue [2] are called choirs of the camps.[3] And he goes on to say :

'Your inmost recesses shall be made public,[4] and the secrets of the House of Israel shall be laid bare.' [5]

This has happened in Africa alone, and God pointed out for what reason all this was done, blaming you with these words :

'Because [6] you have diverted the water of the old pool into your city, and have cast down the walls of Jerusalem to build another wall, and have made a pool between the two walls. You have paid no heed to the old pool, nor to Him who created it in the beginning.' [7]

So you see, my brother Parmenian, that you, by whose first fathers the seed of all these things was sown, find yourselves burdened with the crop.

[1] St. Jerome (*in loco*) writes that *Elam* = *ascensus eorum*. He adds that *Elamites* = *contemptores*.

[2] Casaubon conjectures that Optatus by a mistake of memory thought that Elamite was found for *Sulamite* in Cant. vii, 1 : 'Quid videbis in Sulamite nisi choros castrorum ?'

[3] *chori castrorum* seems to refer to the military bands—the singers of the camp.

[4] *penetralia vestra deferentur ad publicum*. Cf. Is. xxii, 8, Vulgate: 'Et revelabitur operimentum Iudae.' LXX 'Et revelabunt portas Iudae, et aspicient die illo in domos electas civitatis.'

[5] *et secreta domus Israhel nudabuntur*. Cf. Vulgate : 'Et scissuras civitatis David videbitis.' LXX : 'Et revelabunt abscondita domorum arcis David.'

[6] *quoniam*. 'Because.' This is emphatic. *This* was the cause of whatever violence may have been done by the troops of Macarius.

[7] Is. xxii, 11 sq : 'You refused to pay heed to the old pool'—that is to say, you would not count the first Baptism as valid, and you despised 'Him, who created it in the beginning.'

III. The pride of Donatus.

Secondly, Donatus of Carthage was responsible, for through his poisonous wiles [1] the question of [effecting] unity was first mooted.

I shall be able to show that the makers of unity did nothing at our instigation, nor of their own wickedness, but that everything happened through provocatory causes, which were set in motion by Donatus of Carthage, in his lightness of heart, and were due to the actions of individuals controlled by him, whilst he was struggling to be thought great. Is there anyone that can be ignorant of all this excepting yourself; for, since you were a stranger,[2] they have been able to get you to believe idle fables?

Again, who can deny a fact, to which the whole of Carthage is the leading witness, that the Emperor Constans did not originally send Paul and Macarius to bring about unity, but to be his almoner, in order that the poor people [3] in the various churches might be afforded assistance, by means of which they might breathe anew, be clothed, fed, and rejoice?

But when they came to Donatus, your father, and told him why they had come, he, as was usual with him, fell into a rage, and burst out with these words:

'What has the Emperor to do with the Church?'

And, from the fountain of his levity, he poured forth torrents of reproaches no less evil-sounding than those with which he had once upon a time not hesitated to

[1] *veneficio.* G has *beneficio,* but there can be little doubt that *veneficio,* which has the support of all the other MSS., is the true reading. *Beneficio* is obviously a guess, to escape the difficulty of *veneficio.*

[2] *quia peregrinus es* (cf. i, 5; ii, 4; ii, 7).

[3] *paupertas.*

assail the prefect Gregory—calling him 'Gregory, the stain upon the Senate, the disgrace of Prefects,' and the like. Gregory replied to him with patience worthy of a Bishop.[1] Copies of these letters exist and are in the mouths of many chanted everywhere.[2] Then Donatus—against the commands of the Apostle Paul—planned to do a wrong to those in high places, and to kings,[3] on behalf of whom, if he had listened to the Apostle, he would have prayed every day, since this is the teaching of the blessed Apostle Paul :

> 'Pray for kings and for powers, that with them we may lead a quiet and tranquil life.' [4]

For the State is not in the Church, but the Church is in the State, that is to say, in the Roman Empire,[5]

[1] *patientia episcopali.*

[2] *multorum ore ubique cantantur.* Cf. St. Augustine (*Retract.* i, 21) : 'ut ore multorum ubique cantatur.'

[3] *potestatibus et regibus iniuriam facere.*

[4] 1 Tim. ii, 1.

[5] *non enim respublica est in Ecclesia, sed Ecclesia in republica est, id est in Imperio Romano.* It had from very early times been the custom in the Christian Church to pray for the prosperity of the Emperor and the Empire. The preservation and the well-being of the Christian Church was considered to be in a certain sense dependent on the preservation and the well-being of the Roman Empire, inasmuch as the fall of the Empire was commonly expected to synchronise with the coming of Antichrist and the end of the world—a time of utmost stress and affliction for the Church of Christ on earth. It must also be remembered that St. Optatus is writing of the local conditions of his time. In no sense could the Empire, as a whole, be said to be in the Church (even theologically), for as a matter of fact a considerable part of the Empire was still pagan. On the other hand the Church was confined within the temporal jurisdiction of the Empire and overlapped by it on every side. Thus Lord Bryce writes with reference to this passage in Optatus : 'Christianity as well as civilisation became conterminous with the Roman Empire' (Bryce's *The Holy Roman Empire*, p. 11,

which Christ calls Libanus in the Canticle of Canticles, saying:

'Come, my spouse, whom I have found,[1] come from Libanus,'

that is to say, from the Roman Empire, where are the holy offices of the priesthood,[2] and modesty and virginity, which exist not amongst foreign peoples,[3] and which, if they did exist, could not be safe from outrage. With reason does Paul teach us that we must pray for kings and powers, even though the Emperor be living a pagan life.[4] How much more, then, if he be a Christian—how much more if he fears God, and is pious, and full of mercy, as facts prove this one[5] to have been?

For he had sent ornaments to the Houses of God, he had sent alms for the poor, nothing to Donatus[6]! Why, then, did Donatus act like a madman? Why was he full of anger? Why did he refuse the gifts which had been sent? For when the commissioners announced that they were going through the different

eighth edition). The Church therefore had at that period no claim upon the Empire, as such, excepting to be treated with justice; whereas the Empire had this claim upon the Church, that the Church, being an external organisation within itself (though in a different order), should strive to promote peace and harmony and avoid unnecessary antagonism. Such good offices and hearty co-operation the temporal ruler has always a right to expect from the spiritual society within his borders. This the Catholic Church consistently remembered; Donatus as consistently forgot.

[1] *veni, sponsa Mea inventa* (cf. Cant. iv, 8).

[2] *sacerdotia sancta.*

[3] *in barbaris gentibus.*

[4] *qui gentiliter viveret.*

[5] Constans.

[6] *nihil Donato.* Perhaps this should be translated: 'This was nothing to Donatus.'

provinces, and that they would give alms to those who were willing to accept them, he declared that he had sent letters everywhere in advance to forbid that anything which had been brought should be distributed anywhere amongst the poor. Oh, this is the way to console the wretched, to provide for the needs of the poor, to come to the aid of sinners!

God cries out:

> 'It is I who have made both the rich man and the poor man.'[1]

Not that He was unable to give to the poor man also. But, if He had given to the poor as well as to the rich, the sinner would not be able to discover any means of helping himself. On this account has it been written that:

> 'Even as water puts out a fire, so do almsdeeds wipe out sin.'[2]

It is certain that both are now with God—the one who wished to give, and the other who stood in the way of his giving. Well, if God were now to say to Donatus 'O Bishop, what do you wish to make out Constans to have been? If he was innocent, why would you not receive from an innocent giver? If he was a sinner, why did you not permit alms to be given by him, for whose sake I made the poor man?' When questioned after this fashion, what sort of face will he show? Why in his levity and madness did he work so hard to keep good things from so many[3] poor people?

[1] Proverbs xxii, 2. [2] Eccles. iii, 33.
[3] *tantis* (cf. Vulgate: sed haec quid sunt inter tantos? Ioan. vi, 9).

He believed that he held dominion over Carthage; and since there is no one superior to the Emperor excepting God alone (who made the Emperor), Donatus, in raising himself above the Emperor, had already, as it were, passed the boundaries apportioned to humanity, so that he almost regarded himself, not as man, but as God, when he refused to revere him, who, after God, was feared by mankind.

Finally, the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel, rebukes the prince of Tyre, that is to say, the prince of Carthage, with these words:

'O Son of man, speak against the prince of Tyre, saith the Lord God, because thine heart has been puffed up, and thou hast said I am God.'[1]

That Tyre is Carthage is shown, in the first place, by Isaiah, when, after describing the vision of Tyre, he goes on:

'Howl, O ye ships of Carthage.'[2]

In the second place this is also proved by profane literature,[3] and, if there be any other city called by this name, there is no other in which any of those things were done which are known to have been done at Carthage.

'Speak,' says the Lord, 'against the prince of Tyre.' He does not command the prophet to speak against any secular king,[4] nor was he to speak to many,

[1] Ez. xxviii, 2.

[2] Is. xxiii, 1. The Vulgate has *naves maris*; the Hebrew '*Ships of Tarshish*'; the Old Latin (as we see from St. Optatus and St. Ambrose) *naves Carthaginis*; the LXX πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος.

[3] *mundanae litterae.*

[4] *non adversus saecularem aliquem regem.*

but to one—that is to Donatus, Bishop of Carthage. For it was not fitting for Ezekiel, whose words I have just quoted,[1] to compare to any man, excepting to a prince, that Bishop who claimed for himself (as we have said) princedom over Carthage, who puffed up his heart, and thought himself to be superior to men and wished to have even all his own colleagues beneath him—from whose offerings he would never deign to accept aught. Now, his conscience, and Christ his God bear witness to this—and the complaints of many.[2] For in his very intercourse with others, he did them this wrong, that he acted in some secret way or other, alone by himself, and afterwards only in a perfunctory manner[3] mingled with the rest.

[1] It may be well to give here in English those sentences in Ez. xxviii, 2–9, which, as Optatus thinks, may be applied to Donatus the Great. (We possess an African text of the passage in Tyconius Donatista, but I translate from the Vulgate.)

2. 'O Son of man, say to the prince of Tyre: Thus saith the Lord God: Because thine heart has been puffed up, and thou hast said "I am God, and I have sat on the Chair of God [Tyconius has *habitationem Dei habitavi*] in the heart of the sea," although thou art a man and not God,

3. Behold thou art wiser than Daniel. [St. Optatus, St. Jerome, St. Augustine and Tyconius read with the LXX *Numquid tu sapientior quam Daniel?*]

5. And thine heart has been lifted up in thy strength;

6. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God: Because thine heart has been lifted up as though it were the heart of God,

8. Thou shalt die the death of them that are slain [Tyconius has *morte vulneratorum*] in the heart of the sea.

9. Wilt thou still say before them that slay thee "I am God," whereas thou art a man and not God, and art in the hand of them that slay thee?'

[2] *in qua re media est fides*, etc. Du Pin explains thus: 'Testis est conscientia eius.' Albaspinaeus understands *Fides* to mean *Lex Christiana*.

[3] *ut solus secreto nescio quid ageret et postea ceteris perfunctorie misceretur*. Du Pin thinks that by the first phrase of this sentence

In this fashion was his heart puffed up, so that in the end he seemed to himself no longer to be man, but God.

Moreover, in the mouths of the people he was seldom called a Bishop, but was spoken of as 'Donatus of Carthage.' And deservedly was he both addressed and chided as Prince of Tyre (that is of Carthage), because he was the first of the Bishops,[1] as though he were something more than the rest. And whilst he wished to have nothing common to mankind,[2] he lifted up his heart, not like the heart of a man, but like the heart of a god,[3] since he desired to be something more than other men.[4]

But God follows after Donatus with these words:

'Thou hast said, I am God.'[5]

For though he did not make use of this expression, still he either himself accomplished, or suffered, that which would bring about its result.[6] He puffed up his heart in such a way as to think that no other man ought to be compared with him, and, in the swelling of his own mind, he seemed to himself to be something higher than the others. Since whatever is above men, in a sort of way is God.[7]

it is to be inferred that Donatus offered the Divine Mysteries by himself, and held aloof from the public meetings of the other Bishops, clergy or faithful, with whom he would only mix from time to time (*perfunctorie*) as a great act of condescension.

[1] sc. of the Bishops of Africa, where Carthage was the chief See.

[2] *nihil humanum voluit habere.*

[3] Ez. xxviii, 6.

[4] *a ceteris hominibus aliquid plus esse.*

[5] Ez. xxviii, 2.

[6] *quod effectum huius vocis impleret.*

[7] *quia quicquid est supra homines, iam quasi Deus est.*

Besides, whereas Bishops ought to serve God, he demanded so much for himself from his Bishops, that they all had to venerate him with no less fear than they venerated God—because to himself he seemed to be God. And though men are wont to swear by God alone, he allowed men to swear by him, as if by God. If this were done by any man in mistake, it was his duty to forbid it. As, then, he did not forbid it, to himself he seemed to be God. Again, whilst all those who believed in Christ were, before the day of his insolence, called Christians, he ventured to divide the people with God, so that those who followed him were no longer called Christians, but Donatists, and when any people visited him from any province of Africa, he did not ask those questions (which the custom of men always calls for) about the weather, about peace and war, about the harvest, but to everyone who came into his presence, he spoke thus:

'How goes my party in your part of the world?'[1]

As though he had now really divided the people with God, so that, without faltering, he dared to call it his 'party.' For, from his time to the present day, whenever any action is brought before the public courts on ecclesiastical affairs; all [of his sect] have, on being questioned (as we read in the records of the proceedings), spoken in such a way as to assert that they belong to the party of Donatus. Concerning Christ they kept silence. And what am I to say of their clergy, when I read the petition which (as I have stated in the first book[2]) was sent to Constantine,

[1] *quid apud vos agitur de parte mea?*

[2] i, 22.

subscribed by Bishops in this manner: 'Given by Capito and by Nasutius, Dignus, and the other Bishops of the party of Donatus'?[1] They, we know, made their complaints against Bishops; who; whilst they did not belong to the party of Donatus, dwelt in the Catholic Church of Christ.[2]

Since, then, Donatus did not live as a Bishop amongst his fellow-Bishops, and refused to be a man amongst men, it is certain that he puffed up his heart and seemed to himself to be God. And as for the Bishops by whom you were consecrated, their names, my brother Parmenian, are well known to you, and you know also where they lived, and which of them made a petition to return home—in your company. You know, too, who it was to whom they made this petition, and you know his character.[3] Now, all this we have learned through their having brought before the judges in Africa this same old petition in which they had written: 'Given by the Bishops of the party of Donatus.'[4]

What reply, I ask, will they make in the approaching Judgement of God, since they in this world acknowledged equivalently[5] that they belonged, not to the Church of Christ, but freely confessed that they were

[1] Cf. note 3, p. 43.

[2] *in Christi Catholica habitabant.*

[3] *quorum nomina bene nosti, et ubi fuerint non ignoras, et qui vel a quo petierint et qualem rogaverint, ut redirent et tecum redire potuissent, et nos didicimus*, etc. St. Optatus quite lost his thread in this long sentence, where we find one of his numerous *anacolutha*. In my English rendering I have endeavoured to make it grammatical—involved it must always remain.

[4] Cf. once more note 3, p. 43.

[5] *alio modo = aliquo modo.*

of the party of Donatus, though it is written in the Gospel that Christ has said :

'He that confesses Me before men, him will I confess before My Father'?[1]

These men confessed, not Christ, but Donatus.

That the evidence by which clearly to identify the person of Donatus might be by no means scanty there is yet another proof, with which the above-mentioned accusation was closed. God had said that Donatus[2] would not die upon the earth.[3] That this is the case is known to all. He dwelt in the house of God, but lived in the heart of the sea. We read that the sea always signifies the world. It was not enough for him to be beloved by some Christian people, but, by reason of his acquaintance with worldly letters, he was also in the heart of the sea, that is, was beloved by the world,[4] and on account of his knowledge seemed to himself to be wise. But of this wisdom of his God made little,[5] saying :

'Art thou more wise than Daniel?'[6]

With how great reason, and how well, has been humbled that wisdom of his, which made him think himself wiser than was Daniel (when he refused the gifts of the King), and would not accept that which had been sent by a Christian Emperor. And he

[1] Matt. x, 32. Luke xii, 8.

[2] *illum.*

[3] The reference is to Ez. xxviii, 8 : 'Morieris in interitu occisorum *in corde maris*'—*in the heart of the sea.*

[4] *id est in amore saeculi.* That is, he was beloved by worldly people.

[5] *hanc sapientiam eius evacuavit Deus.*

[6] Ez. xxviii, 3.

seemed to himself to be a new Daniel, or to have been raised above Daniel in wisdom, for we read that Daniel, when he was once required to receive presents from King Balthassar—a ring; a chain and the rest—answered thus:

'Thy gifts to thyself, O King.'[1]

He answered with wisdom, and did not hurl abuse at the King, and did not blame him for what he offered, but put the matter off for a while.

Quite otherwise Donatus, who both spoke to Constans as abusive words as he knew how, and refused what had been destined for the poor. We can see the wisdom of holy Daniel in not accepting that day the gifts that were offered him. For the question that they asked him was still [known only] in Heaven, and it would have been the act of a fool to receive any kind of reward for that which he had not yet in his power to reveal. Therefore he was for the time unwilling to accept these presents. Afterwards, when God showed him what he should say to the King, he told it to Balthassar, and, later on, gladly accepted that which he was known formerly to have rejected.[2] Deservedly, therefore, does God rebuke the Prince of Tyre (that is Donatus), when He asks him:

'Art thou more wise than Daniel?'[3]

[1] Dan. v, 17.

[2] St. Optatus evidently thinks that Daniel could not answer Belshazzar on the same day, but gave his interpretation the next day and then accepted the King's gifts with joy! This seems to us an exceedingly odd notion, and curiously enough there is no suggestion of it in the Book of Daniel, so one wonders from what source Optatus derived it.

[3] Ez. xxviii, 3.

But oh! how far removed is the presumption of Donatus from the character of Daniel! For what Balthassar gave, he gave to Daniel, not to the poor; but that which Constans, the Christian Emperor, had sent, he had sent to the poor, not to Donatus.

So to Donatus God said:

'The wise men have not taught thee their wisdom'[1];

for thou hast refused to learn from the words of Solomon:

'Hide thy bread in the heart of the poor man, and he shall pray for thee.'[2]

Moreover, he would not learn from Daniel himself the lesson which Daniel gave to Nebuchadnezzar, as to how one who had offended God might make satisfaction:

'And do thou, O King,' he said, 'hear my advice, and may it find favour in thy sight. Redeem thy sins by alms-deeds, and the unjust things that thou hast done by having compassion upon the poor.'[3]

Daniel advised a king, who was a sinner and sacrilegious, to give alms. Donatus, who has deserved to be blamed,[4] hindered Constans, a Christian Emperor, from doing deeds of mercy. Therefore is he blameworthy, because wise men have not taught him their wisdom,[5] for he did not suffer the gifts sent by this King to be distributed through his hands.

From all these things it is certain that Donatus

[1] Dan. ii, 27.
[2] Eccles. xxix, 15.
[3] Dan. iv, 24.
[4] i.e. in Ezekiel.
[5] Cf. Dan. ii, 27.

was the fountain from which flowed the causes of the evils which ensued.[1]

IV. An account of violent deeds done by Donatists against Donatists.

So, you see, my brother Parmenian, to whose charge any severity that may have occurred in the work of bringing about unity ought to be attributed. You say that an armed force was asked for by us Catholics. If so, how is it that no one at that time ever saw an armed soldier in the proconsular Province ?

Paul and Macarius came in order to console the poor everywhere,[2] and exhort everyone individually[3] to unity. But when they drew near to the city of Bagaia, then it was that the second Donatus[4] (as we have already written) who was the Bishop of that city, in his desire to oppose an obstacle to unity, and to place a check in the way of the above-mentioned legates of the Emperor, sent his heralds through the neighbourhood, and especially to all the fairs, and called upon his fighting dervishes[5] to come in a body to a place which he had fixed for them. So it was

[1] *unde constat Donatum malarum fontem caussarum.* (Cf. for *caussa* in this sense i, 27 ; iii. 3 : ' seminata est caussa ' ; iii, 14.)

[2] *qui pauperes ubique dispungerent.*

[3] *singulos.*

[4] *alter Donatus.* This word *alter* used here of Donatus of Bagaia makes it absolutely certain that Optatus knew nothing of the distinction between Donatus of Black Huts and Donatus the Great (cf. note 3, p. 45).

[5] *circumcelliones agonisticos.* St. Augustine (*con. Cresconium*, i, 28) describes the conduct of these men, and gives the etymology of the word *circumcelliones* : ' Quis enim nescit hoc genus hominum in horrendis facinoribus inquietum, ab utilibus operibus otiosum, crudelissimum in mortibus alienis, vilissimum in suis, maxime in agris territans et victus sui caussa *cellas circumiens rusticanas*, unde et *circumcellionum* nomen accepit, universo mundo pene famosissimum Africani erroris opprobrium ? '

that at that juncture those men were called together, whose madness had been deemed by these same Bishops, only a short time previously, to have been set on fire by their wickedness.

For when men of this sort were, before the attainment of unity, wandering about in every place, and in their insanity called Axido and Fasir 'Captains of the Saints,' no man could rest secure in his possessions. Written acknowledgments of indebtedness had lost their value. At that time no creditor was free to press his claim, and all were terrified by the letters of these fellows, who boasted that they were 'Captains of the Saints.' If there was any delay in obeying their commands, of a sudden a host of madmen flew to the place. A reign of terror was established. Creditors were hemmed in with perils, so that they who had a right to be supplicated on account of that which was due to them, were driven, through fear of death, to be themselves the humble suppliants. Very soon everyone lost what was owing to him—even to very large amounts, and held himself to have gained something in escaping from the violence of these men.

Even journeys could not be made with perfect safety, for masters were often thrown out of their own chariots and forced to run, in servile fashion, in front of their own slaves, seated in their lord's place. By the judgement and command of these outlaws, the condition of masters and slaves was completely reversed.

So when the Bishops of your party were reproached [with this state of affairs], they are said to have written

to Taurinus, who was at the time in possession of civil authority,[1] saying that as men of this class could not be corrected by the Church,[2] they requested that they should be punished[3] by the above-mentioned officer.

In answer to this letter Taurinus ordered an armed force to go through the fairs, where these mad vagrants were accustomed to wander about.

In the district round Octavum[4] a large number were put to death, of whom many were beheaded. Even to the present day we may count their bodies by the whitened altars or tables.[5] When the custom was introduced of burying some in the basilicas, the priest Clarus[6] in the district of Subula was required by his Bishop to undo the burial.[7] Through this it came to be known that what was done had been

[1] *tunc Comiti.* [2] *in Ecclesia corrigi non posse.*

[3] *acciperent disciplinam.*

[4] A town in Numidia. Amongst the Bishops who were assembled at the Carthaginian Council under St. Cyprian we read of *Victor ab Octavo.*

[5] *per dealbatas aras aut mensas potuerunt numerari.* That is to say, whitened tombs made in the shape of an altar. As the Donatists pretended to look upon these fanatics, who had been justly put to death for murder and other crimes, as martyrs, they raised altars over their graves. (It is well known that the first Christians used to say Mass on altars erected over the bodies of martyrs, e.g. in the Catacombs.) These altars were sometimes called Tables, as in the Catholic Church of the present day. Thus St. Augustine writes (*Sermo de div.* 113): 'Denique, sicut nostis, quicunque Carthaginem nostis, in eodem loco Mensa Dei constructa est, et tamen mensa dicitur Cypriani: non quia ibi est umquam Cyprianus epulatus, sed quia ibi est immolatus, et quia ipsa immolatione sua paravit hanc mensam: non in qua pascat sive pascatur; *sed in qua sacrificium Deo, cui et ipse oblatus est, offeratur.*'

[6] A Donatist priest.

[7] *ut insepultam faceret sepulturam.* This phrase shows that St. Optatus was acquainted with Cicero (*Phil.* i, 1).

done through a command,[1] when not even burial in the House of God was permitted them.

Afterwards the numbers of these fanatics had once more increased ; so Donatus of Bagaia found the means of getting together from them a furious horde with which to oppose Macarius.

Of the same class were those who, out of desire for a false martyrdom, hired men to strike and kill them to their own destruction.[2] From amongst these also they were drawn who cast themselves down headlong from the summits of lofty mountains, throwing away their good-for-nothing lives.[3]

See the character of these men, from whom a Bishop, the second Donatus, provided himself with cohorts !

[1] *unde proditum est mandatum fuisse fieri quod factum est.* The command (*mandatum*) was, I think, that of the Donatist Bishops. At first the circumcellions erected altars over their dead, but in the open air and not in the churches. The later Donatists, when they honoured these slain circumcellions as martyrs, forgot not only that it was their own Bishops who (after the custom had been introduced of burying them in the churches) had ordered their bodies to be exhumed, but also that these same Bishops had begged Taurinus to repress them, since ecclesiastical discipline had no effect. Therefore *they*, not the Catholics, were responsible for the massacres (' *quod factum est* '). Both Casaubon and Du Pin, however, understand *mandatum* to refer to a command not of Donatist, but of Catholic, Bishops, and think that St. Optatus means to say that prejudice was created against Catholics by the exhumation of the dead circumcellions, and that on this account Catholics were reproached for the alleged massacres. But they seem to forget that Optatus has just stated that this was done by the order of a Donatist Bishop. It is difficult to see how his command carried out by the Donatist priest Clarus could create prejudice against Catholics.

[2] *sibi percussores in suam perniciem conducebant.* (Cf. i, 16.)

[3] *qui ex altorum montium cacuminibus viles animas proicientes se praecipites dabant.* Cf. S. Augustine, *Tract.* ii. *in Ioannem*: 'Flammis se donant, aquis se praefocant, praecipitio se collidunt, et pereunt.'

Alarmed, then, at this state of terror, those who had brought the treasure to distribute amongst the poor, conceived the plan, in such extreme necessity, of asking for soldiers from the Prefect [1] Silvester, not to do violence to anyone, but to put an end to the violence which had been arranged by the above-mentioned Bishop Donatus.

In this way did it come to pass that soldiers were seen in arms. Now, consider to whom it is right, or possible, to attribute that which followed afterwards. The fanatics had got together an enormous horde, and it is known that they had prepared an ample commissariat.[2] They had turned a basilica into a sort of public granary, where they awaited those upon whom they might expend their savagery; and they would have done whatever their madness might have urged, had not the presence of an armed force stood in their way.

For, when quartermasters [3] were, as is usual, sent ahead of the soldiers, they were not received with due respect [4]—contrary to the command of the Apostle, who says

'Honour to whom honour is due, custom to whom custom, tribute to whom tribute. Owe no man anything.' [5]

Those who had been sent on horseback were maltreated by the men whose names you have blown about

[1] *Comite.*

[2] *habebant vocatorum infinitam turbam et annonam conpetentem constat fuisse praeparatam.*

[3] *metatores* (seu mensores castrorum).

[4] *conpetenter* (ἁρμοδίως).

[5] Rom. xiii, 7.

with the fan of hatred.[1] They were the authors of their own wrongs, and by their example, through the injuries which they inflicted upon others, brought upon themselves whatever sufferings they may have endured. The soldiers who had been thus molested went back to their quarters,[2] and everyone resented that which two or three had endured. All were profoundly stirred up, and not even their officers could hold back these soldiers in their anger. In this way that came to pass, which you have recorded thus, to create prejudice against unity. These events, and others which you have mentioned, have their own causes, and the persons whose names I have given are responsible. *We* have not even seen them, though we have heard of them, just as you have done.

If to have heard of a thing makes us guilty, we hold you to be partners of our guilt, since you have heard of it likewise ; if to know of a thing by hearing gives freedom from responsibility, then that which was done, in consequence of your appeal,[3] by others, ought not to be ascribed to us.

You set down your complaints in due order, saying that under Leontius and under Ursacius a very large number [4] suffered wrongfully, that some were put to

[1] *contusi sunt ab iis, quorum nomina flabello invidiae ventilasti.* This phrase is repeated a little further on (iii, 7) : *quorum nomina cotidie, ut supra dixi, flabello invidiae ventilatis.* Parmenian had evidently made much use of the names of two Donatists (whom Macarius had put to death), in order to stir up ill feeling against Catholics (*flabello invidiae*). St. Optatus here says that these men had brought their death upon themselves by the injuries that they had inflicted on the soldiers of Macarius.

[2] *numeros suos* (literally the rank and file).

[3] *vobis provocantibus* (to the Emperor).

[4] *quam plurimos.*

death under Paulus and Macarius, that under their successors unnamed individuals were proscribed for a time. What has this to do with us, or with the Catholic Church? It is you who have brought about everything of which you complain, for you refused to accept gladly the peace which had been praised by God, valuing the inheritance of schism more highly than the precepts given us by the Saviour.

You have brought accusations against the makers of unity. Blame unity itself, if you can! For I imagine that you do not deny that unity is the supreme good? [1]

How does the character of the workmen affect us, provided it be certain that they effected a work which is good? For the grape is trodden and pressed underfoot by sinful workmen, yet thence comes the wine with which Sacrifice is offered to God.[2] Oil, too, is made by wretched people,[3] some of whom are men of evil lives and unclean tongues, yet it is used without reproach [4] in condiments,[5] in lamps, even in the holy Chrism.[6]

[1] *nam aestimo vos non negare Unitatem summum bonum esse.* Cf. 'Scisma summum malum esse et vos negare minime poteritis' (i, 21).

[2] *inde Deo sacrificium offertur.*

[3] *a sordidis.*

[4] *simpliciter erogatur.* Du Pin writes 'id est eo innocue utuntur.'

[5] *in sapore.* Apparently this refers to the use of oil in ordinary life—as we should say, in salads. If this is so, *in lumine,* which follows, probably does not refer to lamps in churches.

[6] These principles may perhaps seem to contradict that which St. Optatus urged, in his first Book, against the Donatist schism, on account of the character of its originators. But even though it must be granted that, under ordinary circumstances, a man's sin

V. Excuse is made for the severities exercised by the champions of unity.

You say that the makers of unity did evil things.[1] Perhaps this was according to the Will of God, who is sometimes pleased to permit that which He might have prevented. For some evil things are done in an evil way[2]; some evil things are done in a good way.[3] The murderer[4] does an evil thing in an evil way, the judge does an evil thing in a good way when he punishes the murderer.[5]

For this is the Voice of God:

'Thou shalt not kill'[6];

and:

'If any man shall be found sleeping with a woman who has a husband, you shall kill both,'[7]

is also His Voice.

does not vitiate the character of his work, yet evil conduct and bad lives clearly discredit the *founders* of a new religion or sect, who, as is manifest, stand in an altogether exceptional position. Further, in the first book Optatus had argued against the Donatists *from Donatist principles*. They said that the Catholic Church had apostatised by communicating with *Betrayers*. Optatus of course denies that this was a fact, and proves not only that the Donatists themselves had communicated with Betrayers, but also that the very founders of their sect were *Betrayers*. It was an *argumentum ad hominem*, but in the passage before us, as elsewhere, he argues from the true principle that the character of a workman does no detriment to his work.

[1] *malos fuisse.* [2] *male.* [3] *bene.*

[4] *latro* (cf. i, 19, note 9, p. 166).

[5] St. Optatus evidently had not heard of the distinction drawn by moralists (which, as soon as one has heard it, clears up the whole difficulty) between that which is intrinsically evil or evil in itself, and can therefore never be done lawfully, and that which is *in itself* 'indifferent,' and therefore derives its moral character from circumstances and from the intention of the agent.

[6] Exod. xx, 13; Deut. v, 17; Matt. v, 21.

[7] Deut. xxii, 22; Levit. xx, 10.

One God, and two differing Voices. Thus when Phineas, the priest's son, found an adulterer with an adulteress, he stood with raised sword in his hand and hesitated between the two divine Voices. One sounded in his ears :

'Thou shalt not kill'[1];

the other :

'You shall kill both.'[2]

Were he to strike, he would act contrary to law.[3] Were he not to strike, he would fail in his duty.[4] He chose the offence which was better[5]—to strike. And perhaps there were not wanting those who would have wished to brand him as a murderer for inflicting this punishment. But God, that He might show that some evil things are done in a good way, spoke thus :

'Phineas has lessened[6] My wrath.'

Thus God was pleased with the act of homicide, because thereby adultery was punished. What if God has now been pleased with those things which you

[1] *non occides.*
[2] *occidetis utrosque.*
[3] *peccaret.*
[4] *delinqueret.*
[5] *elegit melius peccatum.* The word *peccatum* like *peccaret* (*supra*) is not used here in the real sense of sin—a fault against conscience—but of a fault against an *apparently* unrestricted Law of God, which was seen to be abrogated by another commandment, and is therefore called loosely *peccatum.* 'Melius peccatum' is an oratorical trick—an oxymoron. Cf. 'tacitus loquitur' (v, 3); 'stulta sapientia' (vi, 1); and (iii, 9) : 'ut sartor peccare potuisset.' For this use of *peccare* cf. Cicero (*Or.* 21) : 'non modo in vita, sed saepissime et in poëmatis et in oratione, peccatur'; and again : 'Peccare est tanquam transilire lineas' (*Parad.* 3, 1).
[6] *mitigavit.* Numbers xxv, 11.

say that you have suffered—you who refused to have unity, well pleasing to God, with the whole [Catholic] world, and with the 'Shrines' of the Apostles? [1]

VI. Against the alleged Donatist martyrs.

I am now compelled, against my will, to make mention of those men—whom I do not wish to mention—who are placed by you amongst the martyrs, by whom you swear, as the one thing which those of your communion hold sacred.[2] I should indeed prefer to pass them over in silence, but this is forbidden me by considerations of truth. On account of the names of these men, a mad hatred yelps thoughtlessly [3] against unity, and on account of them there are some who reject unity with contumely, thinking that it is something to be fled from or assailed, because Marculus and Donatus are said to have been slain and to be dead. As if no one at all ought ever to be killed in punishment of offences against God. No one ought to have been injured by the makers of unity, but neither ought the divine precepts to be despised by Bishops, to whom the command was given:

'Seek peace, and thou shalt obtain it' [4];

and once more:

'How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.' [5]

[1] *qui unitatem cum toto orbe terrarum et cum Memoriis Apostolorum, quae Deo placita est, habere noluistis.* Optatus once more urges union with (1) the rest of Catholic Christendom, and (2) with the Apostolic See of Rome, where rest the bodies of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul (cf. ii, 4).

[2] *tanquam per unicam religionem vestrae communionis. Religio* is here the sacredness of an oath.

[3] *inconsiderate rabida latrat invidia.*

[4] Ps. xxxiii, 15. [5] Ps. cxxxii, 1.

And again :

'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the Sons of God.'[1]

Whatever evils those persons who refused to hear these words willingly, or loyally to carry them out, may have endured, they have themselves—if to be killed is an evil—brought their own evil upon themselves.[2]

VII. Macarius is defended from the Donatist calumnies.

But you contend that Macarius is to be blamed, because you think that his actions were not in accordance with the Will of God. Yet you will find men of old who were guilty of similar conduct. You should bring your charge first against Moses himself, the Lawgiver,[3] who, coming down from Mount Sinai, when the Tables of the Law on which it had been written :

'Thou shalt not kill,'

had scarce been promulgated,[4] ordered three thousand men to be killed in one instant.[5]

Put Macarius aside for a little while. First appeal to[6] Phineas, the priest's son, whom I mentioned just

[1] Matt. v, 9.

[2] *mali sui ipsi sunt caussa.* Cf. S. August. (*c. litt. Petil.* ii. 20) : 'Illi, de quibus maximam invidiam facere soletis, Marculus et Donatus, ut moderatius dixerim, incertum est, utrum se praecipitaverint, . . . quapropter de omnibus talibus invidiosis criminibus hoc vobis . . . libera et secura voce respondet [Ecclesia Catholica] : Si non probatis quod dicitis, ad neminem pertinet ; si autem probatis, ad me non pertinet.' This is precisely the statement and argument of St. Optatus in this Book.

[3] *Legislatorem.*

[4] *prope-necdum propositis tabulis legis.*

[5] Cf. Ex. xxxii, 13 ; Ex. xxi, 23 ; Deut. v, 17 ; Matt. v, 21.

[6] *in iudicium provocate.*

now,[1] to judge you—if indeed you know where to find any judge excepting God. For that which you blame has been praised by God in His own person, because it was done through zeal for God.[2] Meanwhile suppress for the moment [3] charges prompted by hatred against Macarius.

First give your mind [4] to the Prophet Elias, who at the brook Cison,[5] in obedience to the Will of God, slew four hundred and fifty men. But perhaps you will answer that these were slain deservedly—your partisans [6] unjustly. Punishment never follows [7] without due cause. Moses inflicted punishment (as we have said), and Elias, and Phineas—but you will not have it that Macarius punished with justice.

If those who are said to have been killed had in no way offended, it may be granted that Macarius was guilty in that which was done by him alone—a business of which we know nothing, but which was provoked by you.

Why is prejudice created against us for things that were done by somebody else? Moreover, *you* are the cause of that which is said to have occurred,

[1] Cf. Num. xxv, 20.

[2] *nam quod accusatis, in persona ipsius a Deo laudatum est, quod in zelo Dei factum est.* Both Ziwsa and Du Pin print a comma after *ipsius*, but I venture to think that it should be rather after *accusatis*, and have translated accordingly.

[3] *subprimite interim.*

[4] *recurrite primo.*

[5] Cf. 3 Kings xviii, 40.

[6] *illos . . . istos.*

[7] *nunquam sequitur vindicta.* Killing is not to be called 'punishment' unless when due cause has been given. 'Therefore,' says St. Optatus to the Donatists, 'you object that in the case of Macarius it should not be called "punishment," but murder.'

for it came about on your account, who were 'outside'[1] (even as you are still outside), not on account of us, who dwell 'within,' and have never departed from the root.[2]

But, since we have spoken concerning the above instances in order, let us now see why Moses commanded three thousand to be slain, why Phineas two, why Elias four hundred and fifty, why Macarius those two whose names you daily (as I have already said) fan with the fan of hatred.[3]

It is clear that those were punished who despised a divine command; for

'Thou shalt not make a graven image'[4]

is the Voice of God, and

'Thou shalt not commit adultery'[5]

is the Voice of the same God. The same God has said

'Thou shalt not offer sacrifice to idols'[6]

and

'Thou shalt not make a schism.'[7]

And

'Seek peace and thou shalt obtain it'[8]

is the Commandment of the same God.

In the days of Moses the people of Israel worshipped the head of a calf, which they had made in a sacrilegious

[1] *foris.* Outside the Church.
[2] *qui intus habitamus, et nunquam de radice recessimus.*
[3] *flabello invidiae ventilatis* (cf. iii, 4).
[4] Ex. xx, 4. [5] Deut. v, 8. [6] Cf. Ex. xx, 5.
[7] Cf. 1 Cor. i, 10; xii, 25. [8] Ps. xxxiii, 15.

fire[1]; on this account three thousand men deserved death, because they despised the Voice of God. Phineas at one blow slew the adulterers. He deserved to be praised by God, because he put to death those who despised His Commands. And the four hundred and fifty whom we read to have been slain by Elias, were slain for this reason, that, contrary to the Command of God—false prophets that they were—they had despised the divine Precepts. So also those two whose death you lay to the charge of Macarius are not far removed from false prophets. (For that God said you would be false prophets, we shall prove very soon.) And in refusing to look at Peace, lest they should dwell in unity with their brethren, they stood out obstinately against the Commands and against the Will of God.

So you see that similar things were done by Moses and Phineas and Elias and Macarius, because the Commands of one God were vindicated by them all.

But I see you now distinguishing between times, and saying that the times before the Gospel were different from those after the Gospel,[2] and you can bring forward the fact that it has been written that Peter put back into his sheath the sword with which he had cut off the ear of the high priest's servant, whom, as though out of devotion,[3] he might have slain.

[1] *quod illis sacrilega flamma conflavit.*

[2] This is probably what all modern readers of St. Optatus will have been thinking. Nor can we honestly say that St. Optatus is very happy in the reply which he hazards.

[3] *quasi devotus.*

But Christ had come to suffer, not to be defended. And if Peter had carried out his intention, it would have appeared that in the Passion of Christ, a servant was punished, not a people freed.

VIII. That neither can Macarius be called a persecutor, nor can those who were put to death by him be called martyrs.

For that Macarius did not draw forth the sword which Peter sheathed, is proved by God, who, speaking to the valley of Sion, says :

'They that have been wounded in thee were not wounded by the sword.'[1]

Show, if you can, that any one man in the time of Macarius was struck with the sword. He goes on to say :

'They that died in thee did not die in war.'[2]

So you should consider carefully whether it be not rash to call men, who experienced no war waged against Christians, by the name of martyrs.

For nothing was at that time either done or heard, such as it has been customary to do or say in a war against Christians[3]—in a war that is called persecution, like that which was carried on under two of the four beasts which Daniel saw rising from the sea.[4]

Of these beasts, the first was like a lion. This was the persecution under Decius and Valerian. The second was like a bear. This was the second persecution under Diocletian and Maximian, when impious magistrates waged war against the Christian Name—amongst whom, sixty years and more ago, were Anulinus in the Proconsular Province, and Florus in Numidia.

[1] Is. xxii, 2.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *in bello Christianorum.*
[4] Cf. Dan. vii, 3 sq.

It is well known to all what their carefully planned cruelty[1] brought about. War, declared against the Christians, was raging furiously. In the temples of the demons the devil was triumphant. The altars were smoking with unclean odours,[2] and those who could not[3] come to the sacrilegious sacrifices were everywhere driven to offer incense.[4] Every spot was made into a temple of abomination.[5] Old men, soon to be on their deathbeds, were defiled[6]; unwitting infancy was polluted; little children were carried by their mothers to the shameful deed; parents were driven to the bloodless slaughter of their children[7]; some were driven to destroy the temples of the living God, others to deny Christ, others to burn the books of God,[8] others to offer incense.

Not even you will be able to pretend that any of these things was done by Macarius. Under the persecutor Florus, Christians were forced to the temples of idols; under Macarius, the slothful[9] were ordered[10] to the [Christian] basilica. Under Florus, the command was given to deny Christ and pray to idols. Under Macarius, on the contrary, all were warned that one

[1] *artificiosa crudelitas.*

[2] *immundis fumabant arae nidoribus.*

[3] Through illness or old age.

[4] Hence those guilty of this sin were called *Turificati.*

[5] *omnis locus templum erat ad scelus.*

[6] *inquinabantur.*

[7] *incruenta parricidia facere cogebantur.* The murders by parents of their children's souls were *incruenta parricidia.* For *parricidium* cf. note 3, p. 40.

[8] *Leges divinas* (the Holy Scriptures).

[9] *pigri*—literally slothful. This, however, seems to have been a word of general reproach, applied indifferently by Donatists to Catholics, and by Catholics to Donatists (cf. vi, 8).

[10] *conpellebantur.*

God should be prayed to by all together in the Church.[1]

Since then you see that no war was waged against Christians; and that God mentions that some have died without war, saying 'And they who died in thee did not die in war'[2]; and that those may well be held to be but doubtful martyrs who were not urged either to sacrilegious sacrifices, or to profane offering of incense,[3] or to denial of the Name of God; and that there is no path to martyrdom excepting through confession—with what reason can you call those men martyrs, who were not confessors? Or, which among them was driven[4] to deny Christ, and confessed His Name?

So, if there can be no martyrdom apart from confession of the Name of Christ—and if in this case no one confessed Christ—and if that which you assert to have been done, was done in vindication of the Commands of God—and if, whereas God had prophesied that this should come to pass, His Commands were vindicated, whilst you are unable to prove that we had any share in it—if these things be so, consider whether it be not merely idle, but also superstitious, to place those who died without persecution[5] where *they* are, who, having confessed Christ, were allowed to die on behalf of the Name of God.

Or, if you will have it that they are martyrs—prove

[1] *ut Deus unus pariter in Ecclesia ab omnibus rogaretur.*

[2] Is. xxii, 2. The repetition of this text shows the importance attached to it by Optatus. This cannot seem to us moderns anything but extraordinary.

[3] *inmunda incensa.*

[4] *coactus est.*

[5] *sine bello.*

that they were lovers of Peace (in which are laid the first foundations of martyrdom), or that unity, beloved by God, was dear to them, or that they lived in charity with their brethren— for that all Christians are brothers we have proved in our first Book, and shall also prove beyond doubt in our fourth).

Those men who (as you maintain) ought to be called martyrs, refused to recognise their brethren, and had no charity.

And let it not be said in their excuse that they were unwilling to hold communion with Betrayers, since it has been most clearly proved that they themselves were the sons of Betrayers. Therefore you have no way of excusing them, for it is abundantly clear that they had not charity, without which martyrdom can neither be [rightly] named nor have any existence, without which the very greatest and most commanding[1] virtue loses its effect, without which the knowledge of all tongues is worthless, without which even the fellowship of angels is of no avail— as says the Apostle Paul:

'If I have the power of commanding mountains so as to move them from place to place, and if I speak with the tongues of all nations, even of angels, and if I deliver my body to the flames, and have not charity in me, I am nothing. But I shall be as tinkling brass[2] in the desert, so that the effect of my word should die away there, where there is none to hear.'[3]

If one so great,[4] if the blessed Paul, if the Vessel

[1] *imperiosa.*

[2] *aeramentum* (anything made of brass or copper, see Pliny xxxv, 15) *tinniens.*

[3] Partly a quotation and partly a paraphrase of 1 Cor. xiii, 19.

[4] *si tanta res.*

of Election, declares that (although possessing commanding virtue[1] and the company of angels) he is nothing, unless he have charity, consider whether they ought not to be called something very different from martyrs, who, having deserted charity, may, by reason of that desertion, perhaps have suffered something.

IX. It was necessary to bring about unity in Africa.

The whole world rejoices concerning Catholic unity, excepting a portion of Africa, in which a conflagration has been blown up from a spark. You complain that some evil deeds or other[2] were committed by the makers of unity. No complaint of this kind is made by Italy, or by Gaul, or by Spain, or by Pannonia, or by Galatia, or by Greece, or by any of the Provinces of Asia.

No one was sent there to put things right,[3] because there was nothing there which needed setting right.[4] No tailor[5] (so to speak) was sent to them, because amongst them there was no rent to repair.

Here, too, in Africa, of old—so long as the people remained in unity—the garment had been whole, but it was torn by the envious hand of an enemy. It may be said, metaphorically, that pieces, coming originally from one garment, were hanging loose,[6] and that branches, coming from the same root, were divided one from another.[7]

[1] *quamvis in imperiosa virtute.*
[2] *nescio quae esse commissa.*
[3] *emendator.* [4] *emendandum.* [5] *sartor.*
[6] *pendebant quodam modo panni de una vestis origine.*
[7] St. Optatus here abruptly changes the metaphor. But he at once leaves the thought of the tree and its branches, which he has already developed (ii, 9), and returns to the garment and its rents.

Why does part prefer itself before part?[1] Why does one piece of the garment raise itself above the second, though it cannot prove itself to be better? What if the despised piece were to say:

'Why dost thou sound thine own praises only? Have we not grown up together? Have we not been together in the hands of those who made us up into one, and have we not together been cleansed by Him who washed us[2]? An enemy has wished to cut us off[3] from one another; an adversary has wished to mar[4] our beauty.'

In part of the garment we are still one, but we hang on different sides.[5] For that which has been rent[6] has been partly[7] divided, not totally,[8] since it is surely certain that you and we have one ecclesiastical discipline,[9] and if men's minds are at war, the Sacraments are not at war.[10] Finally, we can also say:

'Together we believe the same truths,[11] and have been

[1] *ut quid se pars parti anteponit?* The Donatists had preferred themselves before Catholics, saying in justification of their schism that the Catholic Church had become corrupt.

[2] *lotorem.* [3] *excidere.* [4] *deformare.*

[5] *in parte vestis adhuc unum sumus, sed in diversa pendemus.*

[6] *scissum est.* St. Optatus here tries to establish a distinction between *scindere*, to tear away without dividing from the garment, and *abscindere* or *excidere* (the word he had just used), to tear away, or cut off, altogether—totally.

[7] *ex parte.* [8] *ex toto.* [9] *ecclesiastica conversatio.*

[10] *si hominum litigant mentes, non litigant sacramenta.* So Catholics now remind the 'Orthodox' Greeks that they use the same Sacraments, and by this remembrance exhort them to unity.

[11] *pares credimus.*

sealed with one Seal,[1] nor have we been baptised otherwise than you; in like manner [2] we read the divine Testament; in like manner together we worship one God; the Prayer of the Lord [3] is one with you and with us. But since, as we have just said, part had been rent asunder, the work of mending [4] had become necessary, whilst parts [of the garment] were hanging on either side.' [5]

When he who arranges or works at a matter of this sort [6] wishes to restore the garment to its former appearance, he torments [7] the threads that are next to his hand.[8] The tailor, who wounds whilst he is mending the rent, displeases you. He who brought it about that the tailor has had the opportunity of offending,[9] should displease you even more. And [remember] that the things which you allege to have been committed by the makers of unity either should be attributed to your fathers,[10] of whose actions they

[1] *uno sigillo signati sumus*, sc. in Confirmation. St. Optatus goes on to speak of Baptism; elsewhere (v, 1) he writes of the seal of Circumcision: 'Iudaei hoc sigillo se insigniri gloriantur.'

[2] *pariter*.

[3] *Oratio dominica*. Some have seen here a reference to the holy Sacrifice of the Altar—the Lord's Prayer *per eminentiam*.

[4] *sartura*.

[5] *partibus hinc atque inde pendentibus*. It is most true that the One Catholic Church can never be divided. Yet, when large numbers of men, still keeping the Faith, fall into schism, they may be said to hang loosely to her in the manner described by Optatus in the text: thus ever since the great Division between East and West, the separated Eastern Bishops have been summoned to the Oecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church, as well as the Uniats who are in her full communion.

[6] *huius rei artifex aut operarius*.

[7] *conpungit*.

[8] *vicina fila*.

[9] *ut sartor peccare potuisset*. (For *peccare* cf. note 5, p. 151.)

[10] *ad parentes vestros pertinent*.

were the result, or came from the Will of God. But we had nothing to do with them.

X. It is shown from Ezekiel that the severity employed against the Donatists was by the will of God.

How will it be if the severities (great though they may have been) were nevertheless inflicted—as we have said—by the Will of God? For we read in the Prophet Ezekiel of a whitened wall, against which God threatened storm, rain, thunderbolts[1] and accusations:

'There shall be false prophets to build up a wall which is ready to fall,[2] crying "Peace, peace"—and where is peace?'[3]

Call to mind how of old you tore away one from another the members of Mother Church.[4] For you were not able to seduce any one family at once. Either the wife departed and the husband stayed behind, or the parents were seduced and the children refused to follow them, or the brother stood firm, when his sister wandered off. At your instigation divisions were made between man and wife—between parents and their children—and you could not even leave in peace that which natural law permits.[5]

[1] *lapides petrobolos.*

[2] *ruinosam* (cf. iii, 2).

[3] Cf. Ez. xiii, 10. There is, however, nothing to be found here, in any extant version, of 'accusations,' unless they be found in the words 'Ubi est litura quam linistis?' (Ez. xiii, 12). (Cf. note 3, p. 168.)

[4] *Matris Ecclesiae.*

[5] *persuasionibus vestris divisa sunt corpora et nomina pietatis, et non potuistis praetermittere quod legitimum est.* In this very obscure passage, at first reading, it will probably seem that *pietatis* refers to *corpora* as well as to *nomina.* But this can hardly be the case. I think that it is clear that *corpora* refers to the relationship between husband and wife, *nomina pietatis* to that between parents and their children. The chief difficulty is as to the meaning of *quod*

No doubt, you have said :

' Peace be with you ' ;

but God on the other hand asks :

' Peace, and where is peace ? '

that is to say :

' Why do you give a salutation concerning that which you have not ? Why do you name that which you have destroyed ? Peace you love not, yet do you give a salutation concerning peace.'

' They,' He says, ' built a wall which is ready to fall.' [1]

The House of God is one.[2]

They who have gone out and wished to make a

*legitimum est.* The context shows that St. Optatus is referring to the division between brother and sister. He has to bring in an idea to correspond to *corpora* and *nomina pietatis.* An unmarried man and woman under ordinary circumstances ought not to live alone in the same house, but natural law makes an exception for brother and sister. ' You,' he says, ' do not spare that affectionate union which natural law approves ' (*quod legitimum est*). Albaspinaeus, however, refers *quod legitimum est* not to the institution of the family, to which Optatus has just been alluding, but to that which is coming, and understands it thus : ' And yet you have not been able to omit the customary salutations.' But this involves a full stop after *pietatis*, which is awkward ; besides it is exceedingly doubtful whether *quod legitimum est* can bear this meaning. Still it may be noted that in ii, 12, St. Optatus uses the phrase *praeterire illud legitimum* for passing over that ' which is prescribed ' at Mass. In his references to the sad divisions in families caused by Donatism, St. Optatus shows a strange forgetfulness of the fact that such divisions were foretold by its divine Founder as an inevitable consequence of the spread of Christianity itself (Matt. x, 34 ; Luke xii, 51). Moreover, they must necessarily have followed upon that conversion of individual Donatists to the Catholic Church which throughout his work Optatus so urgently advocates.

[1] Cf. Ez. xiii, 10.

[2] *Domus Dei una est.* (Cf. iii, 2 : Fecistis quasi alteros muros.)

party,[1] have built a wall, not a house, for there is no second God, to dwell in a second house.[2]

On this account false prophets are said to have made a wall, and if a door be placed [3] in this wall, anyone who enters through that door is [still] outside.[4] Nor can a single wall have the Corner Stone—the Stone which is Christ, who, receiving into Himself two peoples—Gentiles and Jews—joins both walls with the bond of peace.[5]

For a wall has as many disadvantages as a house has advantages. The house protects all that is shut within it, turns the edge [6] of the storm, throws off [7] the rain, keeps out murderer [8] and thief [9] and beast. Thus also the Catholic Church embraces all the sons of peace in her bosom and breast. On the other hand the wall, which has been built in a ruinous state,[10] supports no corner stone[11]; it has a purposeless door [12]; it keeps nothing inside it [13]; but is soaked with the

[1] *partem.*

[2] *quia non est alter Deus, qui alteram domum inhabitet.*

[3] *conlocata.* (Cf. ii, 2, *Cathedram conlocaret.*)

[4] *foris* (sc. outside the One Church, which is the One House of God, of which St. Optatus has just written: 'The House of God is one').

[5] *nodo pacis.* The metaphor seems to require *cement* rather than *knot.* The two walls abut upon the Corner Stone, which makes them into one wall (cf. Eph. ii, 20–21).

[6] *retundit.* [7] *diffundit.* [8] *latronem.*

[9] *furem.* The difference between *latro* and *fur* is that the former word carries with it the idea of violence—in Optatus even of murder (cf. i, 19 etc.).

[10] *aedificatus ruinosus.*

[11] *nec lapidem angularem sustinet* (for one wall has no corner).

[12] *ianuam sine caussa habet* (cf. supra: 'quicunque intraverit foris est'—for when you enter the door you are still out of doors).

[13] *nec inclusa custodit* (for it is a straight line, and one straight line cannot enclose a space).

rain,[1] is struck by the storm, and is able neither to keep off the murderer, nor to stop the thief when he approaches.

The wall belongs to the house, but is not the house.

So your party is a quasi-church, but is not the Catholic Church.[2]

'And,' He says, 'they whiten it.' That is to say that you judge yourselves alone to be saints. You complain that you have had some sufferings (though we had nothing to do with them). Therefore it is certain that these were sufferings which you endured alone, for the time of peace is different from the time of persecution.

If you consider that it was a persecution, tell us, what had all the Provinces, of which the Catholic Church is composed,[3] to suffer together with you?

Since it was 'punishment,' not persecution, the wall suffered alone, against which God threatened storm, rain, thunderbolts and accusations, for thus did He speak:

> 'Why have you built up a ruin? Why have you made it white? Why have you painted[4] it? This is against My Will, saith the Lord.'[5]

You are displeased with the days of a Leontius, of an Ursacius, of a Macarius and the rest. Put right[6] the Will of God, if you can, who has said:

[1] *pluvia udatur* (for it has no roof).

[2] *pars vestra quasi ecclesia est, sed Catholica non est.* (Cf. 'quasi necessaria,' v, 4.)

[3] *est constituta.*

[4] *linistis.*

[5] Cf. Ez. xiii, 12-14.

[6] *emendate.*

'I will rise against the wall in My wrath, and will send upon it much storm and rain, floods and thunderbolts,[1] and I will strike the wall that is ready to fall, and its joints shall be loosened.'[2]

And do not let any of your party object with the question:

'If unity is a good thing, how is it that, after having been so often brought about, it has not been able to last?'

For this reason, that the matter has been arranged thus by God, who threatened storm, rain, stones and accusations.[3] Now these four things could not happen at the same time. First there was a *storm*

[1] *lapides petrobolos.*

[2] Ez. xiii, 13, 14.

[3] Cf. Ez. xiii, 13, 14. In the Vulgate we read 'Et erumpere faciam (*a*) spiritum *tempestatum* in indignatione Mea et (*b*) *imber inundans* in furore Meo erit, et (*c*) *lapides grandes* in ira in consumptionem. Et destruam parietem, quem linistis, et cadet.' From St. Jerome's commentary we find that the LXX had 'Et disrumpam spiritum auferentem in furore Meo, et pluvia inundans in ira Mea erit; et lapides magnos (περιβόλους) in furore inducam in consummationem. Et suffodiam parietem, quem linistis, et cadet, et ponam eam super terram et revelabuntur fundamenta eius, et cadet et *consummemini cum increpationibus*; et cognoscetis quia ego Dominus.' St. Optatus' African version gives us (a) *tempestatem nimiam* (b) et *pluviam, diluvia* (c) et *lapides petrobolos*, et (d) *accusationes*. Where are these last *accusationes*? Probably they are the equivalent of the *increpationes* of St. Jerome. The Greek of the LXX has καὶ συντελεσθήσεσθε μετ' ἐλέγχων. (μετ' ἐλέγχων = *cum accusationibus*.) The *accusationes* were to be the last calamity that should beset the Donatists. Then they were to fall. One wonders whether perhaps St. Optatus thought, though he did not like to say so expressly, that his book contained these destined 'accusations'!

under Ursacius.[1] The wall [2] was then shaken, but did not fall, so that *rain* might have an opportunity to work.[3] *Rain* then followed under Gregory.[4] The wall was made wet, but was not swamped,[5] so that the stones might have their opportunity. Under the makers of unity the *stones* followed after the rain. The wall was scattered about,[6] but built itself up again from its foundations. Three things have already been accomplished. Accusations are still due to you, but how they are to come and when, is known to Him, who has been pleased to make these declarations concerning you.

XI. It is shown that the Donatists are deceivers.

And that no one might doubt as to the meaning of this, God has added these words :

'The things which I speak concern not the clay[7] or the side[8] [of the wall] or the wall [itself], but false prophets who deceive[9] My people.'[10]

Consider whom this word 'deceive' fits. All were in communion with us. You rushed in upon us in our absence,[11] but, in order to possess those whom you coveted, you had to beguile them—and all men know what are your words of beguilement.

[1] Cf. iii, 4.
[2] The Donatist schism.
[3] That something might be left for the rain to do.
[4] Cf. iii, 3.
[5] *udatus est, sed non maduit.*
[6] *dispersus.*
[7] *luto.*
[8] *latere.*
[9] *seducunt.*
[10] Cf. Ez. xiii, 2.
[11] *nobis absentibus inruistis.*

You are wont to say:

'Look behind you.'[1]

You are wont to say:

'Redeem your souls.'[1]

You are wont to say to Christian men—even to clerics:

'Be ye Christians.'[1]

But in saying 'Look behind you,' you are acting against the gospel, in which it has been written:

'No man who holds the handle of the plough and looks behind him shall enter the kingdom of heaven.'[2]

And do you wish to know what was the fate of the one who looked behind, and of the one who looked before? Remember those who escaped from Sodom—Lot and his wife. She looked behind her and was changed into a pillar of salt, whilst he who looked before him escaped free.[3] Why then do you say 'Look behind you'? Moreover, when you say 'Redeem your souls,' I would ask from whom did you buy them, that you should sell them? Who is that angel who deals in souls as in the market-place?[4] When you say 'Redeem your souls' you are renouncing the Redeemer, for Christ alone is the Redeemer of souls, which before His coming were possessed by the Devil. These Christ our Saviour redeemed in His Blood, as the Apostle says:

'You have been bought at a great price.'[5]

[1] *Adtendite post vos. Redimite animas vestras. Estote Christiani.* These were evidently catchwords in common use among the Donatists.

[2] *nemo tenens manicam aratri post se adtendens* (cf. Luke ix, 62).

[3] Cf. Gen. xix, 26.

[4] *quis est ille nescio quis angelus, qui nundinas facit animarum?*

[5] 1 Cor. vi, 20; vii, 28.

For it is certain that we have been all redeemed by the Blood of Christ. Christ has not sold those whom He redeemed. Souls bought by Christ cannot be sold, to be redeemed again—as you would have it [1]—by you.

Again, how can a soul have two Lords? Or, is there, perhaps, a second Redeemer? What prophets have announced that a second is to come? What Gabriel has spoken a second time to a second Mary? What Virgin has a second time given birth to a Child? Who has worked new or second deeds of power? [2]

If there is none, save One, who has redeemed the souls of all believers, what means it that you say 'Redeem your souls'? What kind of thing is this that you say to Christian men—even to clerics—'Be ye Christians'? And you dare to say to each one, as though you expected a miracle [3]:

'Gai Sei, or Gaia Seia,[4] art thou still a pagan man or woman?'

You call him, who has acknowledged [5] that he has been converted to God, a pagan—him you call a pagan, who has been washed by us or by you neither in our name, nor in yours, but in the Name of Christ (for some there are who have been baptised by you, and

[1] *sicut vultis.*

[2] *quis virtutes novas aut alteras fecit?* (Cf. 'Suam virtutem mittere'; 'a Filio Dei tantas celebrari virtutes,' v, 8.)

[3] *cum miraculo quodam.*

[4] Common names, as if we should say 'Mary, or Nicholas' (cf. vi, 8). So St. Augustine (*De Bapt.* ii, 7) tells us that the Donatists used to say to Catholics 'Bonus homo esses, si non esses Traditor, consule animae tuae, esto Christianus.'

[5] *professus est.* Sc. by Baptism.

have afterwards passed over to our Communion)—him you call a pagan, who before the altar[1] has prayed to God the Father through His Son. For whoever has believed, has believed in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, yet him you call a pagan after his Profession of Faith!

If—which God forbid—any Christian should fall away,[2] he may be called a sinner; a pagan he cannot be a second time.[3]

But all these things you wish to be held of no account. And if he, whom you deceive, listens to you,[4] then his consent alone, and the stretching forth of your hand,[5] and a few words spoken by you are enough in your sight[6] to make a Christian out of a Christian,[7] and he seems to you to be a Christian who has done what *you* want, rather than the man whom Faith has drawn [to Baptism].

XII. A calumny that had been brought against Macarius.

And if anyone should be rather slow in giving adhesion to your deceitful words, you have no lack of arguments, with which you may with some ease[8] persuade men, even against their will, to do what you like—telling them that it has been heard from the lips of your old Bishops[9] that he who partook or

[1] *ante aram.* Catechumens were not allowed to pray before the altar and were not taught the Our Father until just before Baptism.

[2] *deliquerit.*

[3] For a baptised man to become a pagan would be a miracle (*miraculum quoddam*), for 'quod factum est (sc. Baptisma) infectum non potest fieri.'

[4] *si tibi consenserit.* [5] In Penance. [6] *iam tibi.*

[7] *christianum faciunt de christiano.* [8] *quasi facile.*

[9] *qui iamdudum in vestro collegio fuerant.*

received[1] of the sacrifice of unity as it drew near,[2] partook of a sacrilegious sacrifice.[3] We do not deny that this was said by some, who, as is certain, afterwards offered, with complete security, that sacrifice from which shortly before they had held back the people.[4] But one consideration made them speak in this fashion, quite another consideration determined their action.[5]

For with regard to those who are reported to have said these things, they were led thus to speak by a false rumour which had filled their ears, and those of all the people. For it was said that Paul and Macarius would come at that time, to be present at the sacrifice, and that, when the altars were set in festal array,[6] they would bring out an image,[7] which they would first place upon the altar, and that then in this way was the sacrifice to be offered.

As soon as their ears heard this, not only were their minds disquieted, but everyone's tongue was stirred up to use these words, so that all who had heard the story cried out :

'He who partakes of this, partakes of a sacrilege.'[8]

[1] *qui gustaret aut acciperet.*

[2] *de sacrificio adventantis unitatis,* = 'of the Sacrifice of [the newly recovered] Unity,' i.e. who communicated at the general Communion of union.

[3] *de sacro*—sc. sacrilego. St. Optatus will explain immediately that the Donatists put about the calumny that Paulus and Macarius would cause the images of the Emperors to be exposed on the altar during the offering of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist in their camp. Hence they concluded that the Catholic Sacrifice was not dissimilar to the sacrifice of the Pagans—a sacrilege (*sacro*).

[4] *quos constat postea tota securitate fecisse, unde paulo ante populos deterrebant.*

[5] *alia ratio exegit has voces, alia invitavit in factum.*

[6] *cum altaria solemniter aptarentur.*

[7] sc. of the Emperor.

[8] *qui inde gustat de sacro gustat.*

And rightly would this have been said, if any corresponding truth had attached to such a tale.

But when the above-mentioned officers arrived, nothing was seen of that, concerning which a little before lying reports had been spread. Christian eyes saw nothing to shock them, their sight afforded no proof of those things which had upset their hearing.

No stain was beheld, and the solemn rite was observed after the accustomed manner.[1] When they saw that in the divine sacrifices [2] nothing was changed, or added or taken away, the Peace which God has praised was pleasing to men of good will.[3]

On this account none of those ought to be blamed who from your body has made his way to Peace.[4] They who had been disturbed by an unfortunate story were strengthened by the simple and pure truth. And let it not be said that he [who came from you to Unity] of the bitter has made the sweet, or that of the sweet he has made the bitter.

The bitterness, which was proclaimed by falsehood, remained and continued in the breast of [mere] opinion ; the truth which was seen with the eyes, having its own sweetness in itself,[5] was separated from the boundaries of a false opinion. So neither was that which is sweet made out of bitterness, nor was that

[1] *visa est puritas, et ritu solito solemnis consuetudo perspecta est.*

[2] *divinis sacrificiis.*

[3] *volentibus* :—the reference is to 'Pax hominibus bonae *voluntatis.*'

[4] i.e. to the Unity of the Church (cf. i, 1 etc.). *qui de collegio vestro ad Pacem transitum fecit.*

[5] *in se.*

which is bitter made out of sweetness. For what was seen was something else and quite different,[1] and the report had been very far from [2] the actual facts.

So, you perceive that you have brought forward your abusive accusation unjustly, making up a story, at your own pleasure, of whatever you liked, to tear in pieces [3] Macarius and Taurinus. You have lost that, which you were quite clever enough to have seen, whilst hatred has led astray your senses, and closed the avenues of your understanding.

## APPENDIX TO BOOK III.[4]

XIII. In what way and why Macarius was admitted to Communion.

Now your malice has come to such a pitch that you say that Macarius after these events ought not to have been admitted to Communion, but rather should have been repelled by Catholic Bishops. In the first place, communion has only one name, but various modes. A Bishop is in communion with a Bishop in one way and a layman is in communion with a Bishop in another way.

[1] *et aliud et extra est.* Casaubon remarks here that he does not think that St. Optatus meant to say anything more than what no doubt he might have said much more simply: 'That which is seen is very different from that which is heard.' But he adds that, by the word *extra,* bitter gossip, which is outside of us, and is only *heard,* may perhaps be here subtly contrasted with the inherent sweetness which truth has in itself, and which we can, if we will, *see* for ourselves.

[2] *longe fuerat.* Had been a complete misrepresentation.

[3] *ut lacerares.*

[4] These two chapters are given both by Ziwsa and Du Pin as the last two chapters (vi and vii) of Book VII, but are evidently an appendix (written later) to Book III. (cf. p. 271).

Secondly, it would be a grave matter if Macarius had done that which he is said to have done, of his own will, since those who act thus are punished by the public courts and the Roman laws. For that man is a murderer who, compelled by no necessity, by no one's commands, by no superior authority, but, driven on by rage, of his own will, does what the laws forbid. But it was in consequence of your appeal[1] that Macarius did what he is said to have done.

He was not a Bishop, and did not discharge the duties of a Bishop. Neither did he lay hands on anyone, nor did he offer sacrifice. Wherefore, as it is clear that he had nothing to do with the functions of Bishops, no Bishop was polluted by reason of one who did not offer sacrifice with Bishops. Nothing remains for you but to urge that he communicated with the people, and, indeed, it is certain that he spoke amongst the people, but only to press some point, not to preach—which belongs to Bishops.[2] For he spoke, if he was able to speak at all, stripped of any authority. On the other hand, a Bishop's discourse is approved by all, being adorned with sanctity, that is to say, with a twofold salutation. For a Bishop does not commence to say anything to the people without first saluting the people in the name of God. As he begins, so does he end. Every sermon in the church is begun by the name of God and with the name of God is also ended.

[1] *vobis provocantibus*, sc. to the Emperor (see iii, 1).

[2] *non tandem tractandi, quod est Episcoporum.* We learn from St. Jerome and from St. Possidius in his life of St. Augustine that in the churches of Africa priests were not permitted to preach in the presence of a Bishop. But Casaubon has no difficulty in showing that Baronius was mistaken in thinking that this custom —which St. Augustine tells us (*Ep.* lxxvii) was abolished in his lifetime—was ever universal, or that priests were anywhere forbidden to preach excepting when a Bishop was present. Still preaching the Word of God has always been regarded in the Catholic Church as *per se* the duty of a Bishop, only *per accidens* that of a priest.

Which of you will dare to say that Macarius saluted the people after the manner of Bishops? Therefore, since he neither saluted before he spoke, nor ventured to salute after having spoken, nor laid his hand on anyone, nor offered sacrifice to God with episcopal rite, how can you say that the College of Bishops can have been polluted, although you see that Macarius had nothing to do with any episcopal duty?

Your malice, having been in this point trodden under foot by the footprints of truth, is seen again to raise its head. For you say that he ought not even to have communicated amongst laymen. Yet it is certain that he was (as the Apostle Paul shows) a minister of the Will of God, and what wonder, if even the pagan judges should be considered ministers of the Will of God, according to the Apostle who says:

'The judge does not bear the sword without reason,[1] for he is a minister of the Will of God.'

So, too, Macarius was a judge in his own person. And if he did not act judicially, he ought, by the laws of Rome, to have been punished by the judges. Or, if you say that even so Macarius should not have been admitted to communion, still we do not see that he ought to have been repelled, who acted in the same kind of manner as did Moses, whom God did not reject after twenty-three thousand men had been killed, but called him to speak with Him a second time.[2] We do not see that he ought to have been repelled, who did the same thing as did Phineas (whom I have mentioned above), and then deserved to receive Divine praise.[3] It does not seem to us that he ought to have been repelled, who did that which was done by Elias the prophet, when he slew so many false prophets.[4] (For that they too were false teachers we have proved above.)

[1] Rom. xiii, 4.
[2] Cf. Ex. xxxii, 28.
[3] Cf. Num. xxv, 11.
[4] Cf. 3 Kings xviii, 40.

XIV. That even if Macarius was guilty, he ought not to have been repelled from Communion.

But were we to keep silence concerning these examples and admit with you that Macarius was guilty—even so, he ought not to have been repelled by us in the absence of an accuser. For it has been written that no man should be condemned before his case has been heard.

Tell us, then, who accused him and was not listened to? Tell us (if you can) that Macarius confessed his fault and that we did not pronounce sentence. For after all, we are in the Church judges of a kind,[1] as you yourselves do not deny. Indeed, you maintain that we ought to judge in accordance with truth. We, then, cannot do that which God has not done. In His Judgement He has thought well to separate persons, and has not willed that one man should be at the same time accuser and judge. For no man can in one case at the same moment bear the weight of two persons,[2] so as to be in the same judgement both accuser and judge. This is a thing which God has not done by His omnipotence, but, in order to set before us the form of passing judgement, has taught us that neither should a guilty man be condemned without an accuser, nor should he be the accuser, who would be the judge in the same case.

Accordingly, at the very beginning of the world, when men were commencing to be born, after his brother Abel had been killed by Cain, we read that God called Cain and asked him where was his brother.[3] He doubled his sin and said that he did not know, as though he would make God ignorant, and when could there be anything not known to God, under whose eyes and countenance are all things which are done? Nevertheless, God does not judge without an accuser and asks concerning a thing which surely He knew. And yet you wish us to repel one whom we have not seen doing any evil, and who has had no one

[1] *sumus enim qualescumque iudices in Ecclesia. Qualescumque* is written modestly, in comparison with secular judges.

[2] *duas portare personas.*

[3] Gen. iv, 9.

to accuse him. I perceive here what your malice is about to whisper: you will say that what has been done has not escaped our knowledge. We acknowledge that we have heard about it, but to condemn one whom no man has ventured to accuse would be to sin. If you tell us that his deed has not escaped us, will you tell God, who had seen the brother's murder, why He asked about it? It would not have been right for us to do something which God refused to do, when He would not pass sentence, excepting on one who was guilty. You must find an accuser. Otherwise the condemnation could not be just—unless he who should pass sentence was himself to be the accuser! Wherefore God says:

'Behold thy brother's blood. It cries to me from the earth.'[1]

Thus it is that, since by no means can you prove that Macarius was accused before us by any man, you cannot find fault with our judgement.

[1] Gen. iv, 10.

# BOOK THE FOURTH

## An Answer is made to certain Arguments of Parmenian, drawn from various Passages in the Old Testament.

I. The Argument of this Book.

We have now, my brother Parmenian, shown openly and clearly that in charging us with asking for the help of the soldiers, you have calumniated us to no purpose.[1] Now learn this also, that what you have said about the Sacraments and sacrifice of a sinner[2] refers to you rather than to us.

Since a man is not necessarily a sinner[3] because you have so chosen to term him, it would be equally easy for us, copying your gratuitous assumption,[4] to say that you are the sinners. But assumptions of this kind on both sides should be sent packing.[5] Let neither of us judge the other with man's judgement.

It belongs to God to know who is guilty; His it is to pass judgement. Let then all of us, who are

[1] Cf. iii, 4.

[2] *de oleo et sacrificio peccatoris.* For this phrase cf. i, 5, 6, 7; iv, 7, 9. For *oleum* cf. note 3, p. 11.

[3] *non ille debet esse peccator.*

[4] *vestram praesumptionem.* The Donatists boastfully claimed that the validity of the Sacraments depended upon their personal holiness. This was the 'presumption' with which they started.

[5] *facessat ex utraque parte praesumptio.* Cf. 'facesse Tarquinios' (Liv. i, 47).

but men, keep silence. Let God alone point out the sinner, whose sacrifice is unclean,[1] and from whose hands one who wishes to be anointed should fear to receive unction.

How most clearly true this is, acknowledge, my brother Parmenian!

II. That the Donatists are the Brethren of Catholics.[2]

If, that is, you are freely content to hear this ascription of brotherhood which I have so often used. And I would beg of you to recognise that, however distasteful the word *brother* may be to you, still it has of necessity to be employed by us, lest perchance (considering the proof that it ought to be used) we should, by refraining from it, be blameworthy. For, if you are not willing to be my brother, I should begin to be unbrotherly,[3] were I to keep silence concerning this name. For you are our brethren, and we are yours, as the Prophet says:

'Has not one God made you, and one Father begotten you?'[4]

Nor can you avoid being our brethren, since to all has it been said:

'You are all gods and sons of the Most High.'[5]

And both you and we have received the one command in the words:

[1] *cuius sacrificium est canina victima.* *Canina* = Like that of a dog. Cf. infra iv, 6: *quasi qui victimet canem.* The reference is to Deut. xxiii, 18: 'Non offeres pretium *canis* in domo Domini Dei tui'; cf. also Is. lxvi, 3: 'Facinorosus qui sacrificat Mihi vitulum, quasi qui *canem* occidat' (the reading of St. Aug. *c. ep. Parmen.* ii, 5).

[2] The whole of this chapter is a digression (cf. i, 3).

[3] *impius.* [4] Malach. ii, 10. [5] Ps. lxxxi, 6.

'Call no man your father on earth, because One is your Father in the Heavens.'[1]

Our Saviour Christ alone is the Son of God by Birth,[2] but both you and we have been made sons of God in the same manner, as it has been written in the Gospel:

'The Son of God has come. As many as received Him, to them has He given the power to become sons of God, to those who believe in His Name.'[3]

We have both been made and are called His sons; you have been made His sons, but are not so called,[4] because you are not willing to be in peace, or to listen to the Son of God Himself, when He says:

'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.'[5]

Christ by His coming recalled God and man to Peace,[6] and

'taking away the wall of partition, made both One.'[7]

But you will not have peace with us, that is, with your brothers. For you cannot escape being our brothers—you whom together with us one Mother Church has borne from the same bowels of her Mysteries,[8] and whom God the Father has received in the same manner as sons of adoption.

Wherefore Christ, foreseeing this time—how it

[1] Matt. xxiii, 9.
[2] *solus natus est Filius Dei.*
[3] John i, 11.
[4] They had been made the sons of God by Baptism, but had, by reason of their schism, lost their right to the title.
[5] Matt. v, 9.
[6] *Deum et hominem revocavit in Pacem.* A very strong phrase.
[7] Eph. ii, 13.
[8] *quos iisdem Sacramentorum visceribus* (cf. ii, 10).

would come to pass that you should to-day be at variance with us, gave such commands with regard to prayer, that, at least in prayer,[1] unity might remain, and that supplications might join those who should be torn asunder by faction. We pray for you, for we wish to do so, and you pray for us, even though you do not wish it. Otherwise let any one of you say :

'*My* Father, who art in Heaven,' and 'Give *me my* daily bread,' and 'Forgive *me my* trespasses, as *I* forgive *him* who trespasses against *me*.'

Accordingly, if things which have been prescribed may not be changed, you see that we have not been absolutely[2] divided from one another, whilst we willingly pray for you, and you (though unwillingly) pray for us. You perceive, my brother Parmenian, that the bonds of holy brotherhood between you and us do not admit of being absolutely[2] broken.

III. That the Donatists are sinners.

We have now to search for the sinner, at whose hands we should fear to receive unction, or whose sacrifice ought to be disowned.[3]

Let human mistrust give way, and the arguments of both sides keep silence. God alone shall point out who is a sinner. We read in the forty-eighth Psalm in the second division[4] that the Holy Ghost has said :

'But to the sinner God said.'

Here we have to give the whole attention of our mind, and see who is the sinner.

[1] The Lord's Prayer. [2] *in totum.*

[3] *cuius potuit vel oleum timeri, vel sacrificium repudiari.*

[4] *sub secundo diapsalmate.* Ps. xlix, 16. For *Diapsalma* cf. S. August. *Enarr. in Ps. iv*, 4 ; *Quaest. ex utroque mixtim* (Migne, *P. L.* p. 2334) ; S. Hieron. *Ep.* xxviii, *De Voce Diapsalma.*

For, if after we have read :

'But to the sinner God said,'

some such words as these were to follow :

'Thou hast snatched up arms, thou hast marched out of the camp,[1] thou hast stood against the foe in battle array,'

then *the soldier* would have reason to fear, because he might seem to be the sinner.

Or, if He said :

'Thou hast got together merchandise, thou hast gone on journeys, thou hast held fairs, thou hast bought and sold for the sake of profit,'

then *the man of business* would have to fear, because he might seem to be the sinner.

Or, if He said :

'Thou hast built a ship, thou hast fitted it out with rigging and sails, thou hast seized[2] the winds favourable for a voyage,'

then *the sailor* would have to fear, because he might seem to be the sinner.

Or, if after we have read :

'But to the sinner God said,'

these words were to follow :

'Dissension and schism have been displeasing to thee,

[1] *processisti de castris.* This is the reading of G. It is probably a conjecture but seems to give the right sense. RBv read *proiecisti castris,* which it is not possible to translate. Ziwsa conjectures *proiecisti te castris* (thou hast flung itself upon fortresses), but this is hardly Latin. Besides Optatus is not likely to have represented an army as *first* attacking, and *afterwards* as standing in array against the enemy in the field. [2] *captasti.*

thou hast agreed with thy brother and with the One Church, which is in all the world, thou hast communicated with the Seven Churches and with the Shrines of the Apostles.[1] Thou hast embraced Unity '—

if these things were to be read immediately afterwards, then *we* should have to fear that we were the sinners.

But when God says:

'Why dost thou declare My commandments and take My covenant in thy mouth? For discipline thou hast despised, and thou hast cast My words behind thee. Sitting thou didst speak against thy brother, and didst lay a scandal against thy mother's son. Thou didst see a thief and didst run with him, and with adulterers thou hast been a partaker'[2];

then all these things have been said to *you*. Clear yourselves from all of them, if you can!

IV. That the Donatists are despisers of discipline.

So discipline has been held in contempt by you. To what end then dost thou, who dost not obey the covenant, recite the covenant, in which has been set forth the discipline which you[3] will not observe? For you cannot say that you observe something, against which you bear arms!

God says:

'Seek peace, and thou shalt obtain it.'[4]

Thou hast rejected peace. Is not this to despise discipline?

[1] Cf. ii, 14.

[2] Ps. xlix, 16, 17, 18, 20.

[3] St. Optatus here passes abruptly from the singular to the plural number, from Parmenian individually to the Donatists collectively.

[4] Ps. xxxiii, 15.

In the Gospel we read :

'On earth peace to men of good will.'[1]

Thou wilt have neither peace nor good will. Is not this to despise discipline ?

Moreover, we read in the hundred and thirty-second Psalm :

'Behold how good and pleasant it is to dwell together in unity.'[2]

Thou[3] wilt not dwell in unity with thy brethren. Is not this to despise discipline ?

Christ says in the Gospel :

'He who has once been cleansed, has no need to be cleansed anew.'[4]

Thou by rebaptising dost cleanse anew. Is not this to despise discipline ?

God says :

'Touch not Mine anointed, and lay not thy hand upon My Prophets.'[5]

You[6] have stripped so many priests of God of their dignities. Is not this to despise discipline ?

Christ says :

'From this I know that you are My disciples, if you love one another.'[7]

You hold in hatred us, who are surely your brethren ;

[1] Luke ii, 14. [2] Ps. cxxxii, 1.
[3] Here St. Optatus returns to the singular.
[4] John xiii, 10. [5] Ps. civ, 15.
[6] We have the plural once more.
[7] John xiii, 34.

nor have you been willing to imitate the Apostles, by whom Peter was beloved, though he denied his Lord.[1] Is not this to despise discipline?

Thou[2] declarest the commandments[3] of God, and takest His covenant in thy mouth. How dost thou exhort: 'Seek peace,' though thou dost not possess peace? Thou recitest the covenant,[4] and dost not obey the covenant, in which has been set forth discipline.

V. That the Donatists are slanderers and have propagated scandals.

You have been chosen to sit and teach the people,[5] and you slander us who are your brethren. As I have said above, one Mother Church has given us birth, one God the Father has received us, and yet you 'lay scandals against'[6] us by forbidding each of your followers to salute us, or receive from us the customary signs of courtesy.[7]

[1] Cf. vii, 3.

[2] We have the singular again.

[3] *iustificationes.*

[4] Ziwsa has added at the beginning of this last sentence a second *quomodo* and places a note of interrogation at the end (*Quomodo testamentum recitas?*). This addition (for which no reason is given) seems unnecessary. The *recitas testamentum* corresponds well with the *exponis iustificationes Dei* etc. of the beginning of the paragraph.

[5] *electi estis, qui sedentes populum doceatis.* To sit, i.e. when teaching the people. We learn from St. Augustine (*Hom.* xxvi; *Tract.* xix and cxii in *S. Ioan.*; in *Expos.* Ps. cxlvii etc.) that in the Churches of Africa the Bishops only were allowed to *sit* (though an exception was made in favour of those who were ill or tired, at least when the reading was long). He tells us, however, that a far better custom prevailed in some European Churches: 'longe consultius in quibusdam ecclesiis transmarinis, non solum antistites sedentes loquuntur ad populum, sed ipsi etiam populo sedilia subiacent' (*de Catech. rudibus*, c. xiii).

[6] Ps. xlix, 20.

[7] *ne nos salutent, ne a nobis dignationem accipiant.* In the early days of Christianity, Christians were accustomed to salute one

Consider your haughty words, consider your discourses,[1] consider the commands that you have given, turn over your actions in your minds, and you will then find out why the man who formerly asked you for the Sacraments, has feared to receive them at your hands.[2]

There is not one of you who does not mingle abuse of us with his discourses ;[1] not one of you who does not begin in one manner and continue in another.[3] You begin the sacred readings on the Lord's Day,[4] and unfold your comments in such a way as to do us wrong ; you bring forth the Gospel, and heap abuse upon your brother in his absence ; you pour hatred into the minds of those who listen to you, and by your teaching persuade men to live at enmity with one another. By all your discourses you 'lay scandals against' us. Therefore, to each one of you has it been said :

'Sitting thou didst speak against thy brother, and didst lay a scandal against thy mother's son.'[5]

When God reproves the sinner and chides him that *sits*, it is clear that His words are addressed specially

another with the kiss of peace, not only at a stated time in the church during divine service, but also when meeting in the street. Casaubon points out that in Low Latin *dignatio* was used for *facilitas* or *humanitas* and quotes from Sidonius Apollinaris the phrase '*dignitate* clarus, *dignatione* communis.' (For *legitimum*, cf. note 5, p. 164.)

[1] *tractatus*—i.e. *ad populum* = sermons. Ziwsa, however, gives *libellus* as its equivalent.

[2] *et invenietis oleum vestrum timuisse, qui rogabat.* Du Pin rejects this sentence, as not being consistent with the context ; but it is found in all the MSS.

[3] *qui non aut aliud initiet aut aliud explicet.*

[4] *lectiones dominicas.* [5] Ps. xlix, 20.

to you, not to the people who have no permission to sit in the church.[1] You see therefore that without a doubt to you should be referred the Divine Words :

'Sitting thou didst lay a scandal against thy mother's son.'

I have so many times proved that we have one mother, nor can you deny this—you who 'lay scandals against' us—though some of your party allege texts which they have not understood, in order to take away from us even what is usually shared by all men—the courtesy of salutation. For some of you refuse us the embraces that are customary in everyday life,[2] and many are taught not to say 'God speed you'[3] to any one of us, and think that this is commanded by what they have read without understanding it, through not knowing of whom it was that an Apostle[4] has said :

'With such as these not even to take food,' nor 'say "God speed you"' to him, 'for their speech creepeth on like a spreading sore.'[5]

This was said of heretics, whose teaching at that time began to be full of errors, for through the subtle seductiveness of their speech, they introduced diseases,

[1] *non ad populum qui in Ecclesia non habent sedendi licentiam.* Cf. supra : 'Electi estis, qui *sedentes* populum doceatis,' where see note.

[2] *in perfunctoria salutatione oscula denegatis solita.*

[3] *Ave.* [4] *Apostolus.*

[5] We have here three passages joined together in one sentence—1 Cor. v, 11 ; 2 John 10 ; 2 Tim. ii, 17. Parmenian (or possibly some other Donatist) had quoted all the three texts. St. Optatus supposes the context known, and cites a portion of each, without continuing them.

creeping along in the darkness, to corrupt the soundness of the Faith.[1] Such a one was Marcion, who from a Bishop became an Apostate, and brought in two Gods and two Christs; such was Ebion,[2] who argued that not the Son but the Father had suffered; such Valentinus, who strove to take away from Christ His Flesh.

This is that speech which had a cancer [3] to torment the members of the Faith. This has been said also of the heretic Scorpian,[4] who maintained that there ought to be no martyrdom.

[1] *quorum caeperat illis temporibus vitiosa esse doctrina, qui subtili seductione verborum morbis obscure serpentibus corrumperent fidei sanitatem.*

[2] The MSS. have *Ebion.* Du Pin substituted *Praxeas* who was accused by Tertullian. 'Patrem cruci fixit.' St. Optatus probably wrote *Ebion* by a slip of the pen.

[3] *qui habuit cancer.* St. Augustine (*De Bapt. con. Donat.* iv, 12) writes that he would have understood the words in 2 Tim. ii, 17 (quoted above by St. Optatus), 'serpit eorum sermo velut cancer,' of wicked men *within* the Church, but that the authority of St. Cyprian will not admit of this interpretation. He proceeds, however, to argue against St. Cyprian, who had written (*Ep. ad Iubaianum*): 'Nam cum dicant [Apostoli] sermonem eorum [haereticorum] ut cancer serpere, quomodo is sermo dare remissam peccatorum qui ut cancer serpit ad aures audientium?' To this Augustine makes answer: 'Nec foris, sicut nec intus, quisquam qui ex parte diaboli est, potest vel in se vel in quoquam maculare Sacramentum quod Christi est . . . cum Baptisma verbis evangelicis datur . . . si quis per hominem perversum id accipiens . . . remissionem accipit peccatorum non per verba sicut cancer serpentia, sed per Evangelica Sacramenta de caelesti fonte manantia.'

[4] St. Optatus seems to have been led astray here by the fact that Tertullian gave the inscription of *Scorpiace* to the book which he wrote against the heretics, who had attacked the martyrs. Hence apparently he thought that there had been a heretic called *Scorpian.* But at the commencement of this book Tertullian attacks no individual, but terms Gnostics, Valentinians and other heretics in general *Scorpios.*

But let them keep their poisons for themselves, and let no discourse[1] with them be allowed, lest by listening to them simple minds be troubled, however slightly.

Wherefore these are they whose speech has to be avoided, lest it creep in, like a spreading sore.

This was said too of Arius, who endeavoured to teach that the Son of God was made out of non-existing substances,[2] and not born of God—whose teaching, had it not been driven away by three hundred and eighteen Bishops in the Nicene Council, would, like a cancer, have entered the breasts of many.

This was said also of Photinus, a heretic of the present time, who has dared to say that the Son of God was merely a man, not God.

It may have been said of you as well, since your word has introduced no small cancer into the ears and minds of some. This is your word, which you address to the sons of Peace, when you say:

'You have perished. Look behind you. Your soul will be lost. How long do you hang back?[3]'

In this way have you made Penitents of the Faithful; thus have you destroyed the honours due to Priests.[4] Behold! It is your word also, which to-day creeps on as a spreading sore, so that you forbid us the greetings and ordinary intercourse of life.

[1] *relatio. Relatio* = *recounting*, i.e. narrative or *teaching* (from *referre*, to relate). Ziwsa says = *sermo.*

[2] *ex nullis substantiis* ( = ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ) *factum esse.*

[3] *quamdiu vos tenetis?* = quamdiu apud Catholicos manetis? Ziwsa says that *se tenere* here = zögern, sich aufrecht erhalten.

[4] Cf. i, 2; ii, 24 supra etc.

But how could our teaching have produced any such result? We guard the sons of Peace with pure[1] teaching; we lead no strangers astray; we ruin no man. It is therefore clear that you daily 'lay scandals against' us, and it would be a long matter to go through all the ways in which you slander us, and all the kinds of scandal which you 'lay against' us.

VI. That the Donatists are thieves and on what ground.

For also when God says:

'Thou didst see a thief and didst run with him,'[2]

concerning what kind of thievery think you that this has been said? Was it perhaps on account of some stolen article of clothing, or some pocket that had been picked,[3] or about goods the stealing of which brings loss and gain to men?

Yes, without doubt such thefts as these are forbidden; but in this passage God rebukes those which are made from Himself. Do you ask what thefts are made from God? They are to be found amongst you! God's possession is the mass of the Faithful,[4] from which that thief the Devil tries every day to steal something, striving to corrupt in some way or other the morals of a Christian man or woman, and thus to snatch away, if not the whole man—at any rate something or other from the man.

[1] *simplici*. *Simplex* = unadulterated, unmixed by any new teaching or heresy.

[2] Ps. xlix, 18.

[3] *aut de involato gremio*. *Gremium*—the fold of the garment—pocket. *Involato* not from *in-volare* = to swoop upon, but from the unusual verb *in-vola-re* from *vola*, the palm of the hand, = to place in the palm of the hand—to steal (cf. French *voler*).

[4] *possessio Dei est turba Fidelium*.

Since you saw this Thief bringing force to bear against us, you have helped him by your deeds. For none are unaware, that everyone who is born (even though he may be born of Christian parents) cannot be without the unclean spirit, who must of necessity be driven out and separated from a man before the saving laver. This is effected by the exorcism,[1] through which the unclean spirit is cast forth and driven, in flight, to desert places.

The house in the heart of the Believer is made empty, the house is made clean. God enters and dwells therein, even as says the Apostle :

'You are the Temple of God, and God dwells in you.'[2]

Whereas then each [baptised] man is full of God, and that Thief the Devil is endeavouring to steal something away from him, you exorcise that faithful man by rebaptising him, and say to God, who dwells within him :

'Go forth, O cursed one,'

that there may be fulfilled what was spoken by Ezekiel the Prophet :

'And they spoke evil things to Me amongst My people for the sake of a handful of barley and a morsel of bread, that they might kill souls which ought not to die, whilst they announce to My people empty deceits.'[3]

[1] *nam neminem fugit quod omnis homo qui nascitur, quamvis de parentibus Christianis nascatur, sine spiritu immundo esse non possit, quem necesse sit ante salutare lavacrum ab homine excludi et separari. Hoc exorcismus operatur* etc. We see the importance which Optatus attached to the very ancient pre-baptismal exorcism.

[2] 1 Cor. iii, 16.

[3] Ez. xiii, 19: *maledicebant . . . vanas seductiones* (Vulgate 'violabant . . . mentientes populo Meo credenti mendaciis').

So God hears wrongful insults, which are not His due, and departs from such a dwelling as this; and the man who, when he entered the church, was full of God, goes out an empty vessel.

The Devil, who wished, like a thief, to steal something, sees that the whole, from which he was striving to snatch some little thing, has become his by your assistance. Wherefore, of you God said:

'Thou didst see a thief and didst run together with him.'[1]

Again it has been written in the Gospel:

'But when God shall have left a man, he remains an empty vessel, but the unclean spirit wandering through desert places, says, in his hunger[2]: "My house is empty,"[3] that is to say, He who had shut me out has been Himself shut out. "I will go back and dwell therein." And he brings with him seven others more wicked, and he shall dwell there, and that man's last state shall be worse than his first.'

That is:

'Thou didst see a thief and didst run together with him, and with adulterers didst cast thy lot.'

He terms heretics adulterers, and their churches adulterous,[4] which Christ contemns and disowns[5] in the Canticle of Canticles, as though He should say:

'Why do you make churches that "are not wanted[6]"?'

[1] Ps. xlix, 18.
[2] *ieiunus.*
[3] We have here a paraphrase of Matt. xii, 43–45.
[4] Cf. note 4, p. 18.
[5] *aspernatur et repudiat.*
[6] *non necessarias.* Cf. note 3, p. 121.

'One is My beloved, one is My Spouse, one is My dove'[1]

that is, the Catholic Church, in which you too might be.[2] And yet by rebaptising you have chosen to cast your lot amongst adulterers.

It has been most clearly proved by divine witness that you are sinners. It has also been shown that thine auxiliaries have warred against thee,[3] for thou hast brought up to thy relief[4] the saying of the Prophet:

'The sacrifice of the sinner, is as of one who would offer in sacrifice a dog.'[5]

Now, if you have any shame, recognise with grief that *you* are the sinners.

VII. In what sense it has been said: Let not the oil of the sinner anoint My Head.

Also learn this, whose Word it is:

'Let not the oil of the sinner anoint My Head.'[6]

For whose voice is this thou hast not understood? It is surely the voice of Christ, who had not yet been anointed, when He prayed that the oil of the sinner should not soil His Head. Thou hast said, without

[1] Cant. vi, 8.

[2] *Catholica, in qua . . . esse.* Cf. iii, 3: 'in Christi Catholica habitabant,' etc.

[3] *tua auxilia contra te militasse.* We have this abrupt transition to the singular in order to emphasise the fact that Parmenian had quoted this text, which is now turned against him.

[4] *in auxilium addideras.*

[5] Is. lxvi, 3: *quasi qui victimet canem.* We read in the Vulgate 'quasi qui excerebret canem.' The word *victimo* is used in the sense of sacrifice by Apuleius. *Excerebrare* (literally *to beat out the brains*) is found only in the Vulgate. It is translated in the Douay Version: 'He that killeth in sacrifice.' (Cf. note 1, p. 181.)

[6] Ps. cxl, 6.

understanding, that David the Prophet feared the oil of the sinner.

The Psalmist had already been anointed by Samuel. There was then no reason why he should be anointed a second time. Consequently it is the voice of Christ, which says :

'Let not the oil of the sinner anoint My Head.'

It is a prayer, not a command ; the expression of a desire, not a precept. For, were it a command, He would have said :

'The oil of the sinner *shall* not anoint My Head.'

It is therefore the Voice of the Son of God, even then fearing to meet the oil of the sinner, that is of any man whomsoever, for no man is without sin, but God alone. Accordingly His Son feared the oil of man, for it would have been shameful that God should be anointed by man. Accordingly He prays the Father that He should not be anointed by man, but by God the Father Himself. It is then the Son who asks ; let us see whether the Father has granted the request.

This the Holy Spirit points out and makes clear in the forty-fourth Psalm, wherein He says to the Son Himself :

'The Lord thy God shall anoint Thee with the oil of gladness differently[1] from Thy fellows.'

His fellows had been the priests and kings of the Jews, each of whom was known to have been anointed

[1] *aliter a consortibus tuis.* (The Vulgate has '*prae* consortibus tuis.') Ps. xliv, 8.

by men. But, since it was right that the Son should be anointed by the Father—God by God—as the Son asked and the Spirit announced that it had been promised—this the Father fulfilled in the Jordan. For when the Son of God, our Saviour, came there, He was pointed out to John with these words [1] :

'Behold the Lamb of God ; He it is who taketh away the sins of the world.' [2]

He went down into the water, not that there was anything in God that could be cleansed, but the water had to come before the oil that was to come after, thus to commence and ordain and fulfil the Mysteries of Baptism.[3]

For when the waters went over Him, and He was held in the hands of John, the Mystery followed in due order, and the Father fulfilled that for which the Son had prayed, and the Holy Ghost had announced was to come. The Heaven was opened, as the Father anointed. Forthwith the spiritual oil descended in the likeness of a Dove, and sat upon His Head and flowed over Him. On this account He was first called Christ, when He was anointed by God the Father. And lest it might seem that the laying on of hands was lacking to Him, the Voice of God was heard, saying from the cloud :

'This is My well-beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.[4] Hear ye Him.' [5]

[1] *Ad Ioannem ostensus est his verbis.* [2] John i, 29.
[3] In Confirmation: Cf. Tixeront (*op. cit.* ii, 314).
[4] *de quo bene sensi.*
[5] Matt. iii, 17 ; Mark i, 11 ; Luke ix, 35 ; 2 Pet. i, 17.

Here, therefore, we find the meaning of that which was written :

'Let not the oil of the sinner anoint My Head.'

Learn, then, though late, my brother Parmenian, the nature of the truth, for now is the time for learning how to find it.[1]

VIII. That heretics are children of adulterers.

And with regard to that which you have quoted from the Prophet Solomon[2] :

'The children of adulterers shall not come to perfection, and bastard slips cannot take deep roots,'

this may well be understood to have been said in a literal sense. For, if you take it figuratively, you have excused those who are actually guilty of adultery. But grant that it was said in figure. In that case it has been spoken of heretics, whose sacraments are like invalid wedlock, in whose beds is to be found iniquity, where the very seeds [of life] have been corrupted to the destruction of the Faith.[3]

[1] *rationem veritatis, frater Parmeniane, vel sero, addisce, quoniam nunc tempus est invenire discendi.* G reads *tempus discendi invenisti* —evidently an emendation, but the rhythm is wrong, and the reading of the other MSS. gives good sense. Casaubon suggests the very violent and unnecessary change *Nunc non tempus est iuvenile discendi.*

[2] Sap. iii, 16 ; iv, 3 : *filios adulterorum inconsummatos et spuria vitulamina altas radices dare non posse.* (*Vulgate* : 'Filii adulterorum in inconsummatione erunt, et spuria vitulamina non dabunt radices altas.')

[3] *apud quos sunt sacramentorum falsa connubia, et in quorum toris iniquitas invenitur, ubi in exterminium Fidei corrupta sunt semina.* For *toris* Du Pin reads *choris* with v. But the MSS. have *toris*, and the reference to Sap. iii, 16 makes this reading certain (cf. also note 4, p. 18).

When Valentinus maintains that the Son of God was on earth in a phantasm, not in Flesh, he corrupted his own faith and that of his followers. The seed of [spiritual] birth has been rooted out in those who have not believed that the Son of God was born in the Flesh of Mary the Virgin, and that in the Flesh He suffered.

IX. That a certain passage in Jeremiah is to be understood of the idolatrous Jews.

Now with regard to what you mention that you have read in the Prophet Jeremiah that the people of God have done two evil things in that

'they forsook the Fountain of living water, and digged to themselves broken cisterns that can hold no water'[1];

you have indeed read this, but have been unwilling to understand the real state of the case.

In your love for bringing charges, you have twisted round everything so as to abuse Catholics, and, to suit your own purposes, you have attempted to digress a great deal according to your own whims.[2] For if you imagine that everything which has been written by the Prophets belongs to our own times, you are making excuses for the Jews, concerning whom it is certain that it was written, that they forsook the Living God, the True God, the God who had bestowed His Blessings upon them, and made for themselves idols—that is to say, broken cisterns, which can hold no water.

In God the Everlasting Majesty flows over,[3] even

[1] Jer. ii, 13.

[2] *multum ad arbitrium tuum declinare conatus es.* RBv have *destinare.*

[3] *in Deo perennis Maiestas exundat.* This passage is absolutely

as, in a fountain, water freely gushes forth from its channels. But idols, unless they be made, have no being, and wells, unless they be dug, hold no water in their depth.[1] Cisterns cannot be hollowed out without skill and tools, nor can idols be made without a craftsman. In idols there is no virtue that belongs to them,[2] but it is given and applied to them through the mistake of man. Virtue is believed to be in an idol, which is not there of its own nature. A cistern, the making of which is a weary work,[3] is broken with deliberation, so that neither has it water of itself, nor of itself can it hold the water that it has received. Similarly an idol is not anything of itself, and, whilst it is being worshipped, is nothing.

This is the meaning of the Word of God, that His people did two evil things, in that they abandoned the fountain of living water and made for themselves broken cisterns which they had themselves dug out. For the people of Israel had forsaken the true water, had not recognised the Divine Majesty, and had followed the evil worship of idols.

This it is over which God grieves, this it is at which He says that the Heaven has shuddered.

corrupt in RBv. Ideo perennis male destans exultant, sicut in fonte aqua largiter defluentibus venis exuberant. From G it is clear that *Ideo* should be *in Deo* and that *male destans* should be *Maiestas*. Casaubon conjectured *exundat* for *exultant* and *exuberat* for *exuberant*. Ziwsa accepts this emendation. It is the text which I have translated.

[1] *sinus capaces habere non possunt.*

[2] *in idolis virtus naturalis nulla est.*

[3] *cuius fabrica vexatio est* Gb, *vexationes* RB. Casaubon conjectured 'cuius si fabrica vitiata est aquam nec habeat etc.'

For God grieves over the same thing through the Prophet Isaiah, when in this matter He calls to witness two elements with these words:

'Hear, O Heaven, and perceive with thine ears, O Earth. I have brought up and have exalted children. But they have forsaken Me.'[1]

How is it, my brother Parmenian, that you have had nothing to say concerning this passage? Or why is it that there is here no mention of water? It will be seen that, through your love of fault-finding, you have done such violence to the Law, that, whenever you read anything of water, you have, by some conjuring tricks, twisted it round for your purposes of hatred, and have made a sort of drag-net out of malicious arguments, and have thus drawn to yourself all things which in themselves are good.

For what intelligence have you shown[2] with regard to this passage in Jeremy, since God cries out that He has been forsaken, and that cisterns have thus been made? His wrath is concerning Himself, not concerning something which is His, for the Baptismal Water belongs to God, but is not God Himself.[3] And if you think that you [and your baptism] have been deserted, pray when were any of you baptised[4] among us, so that it

[1] Is. i, 2 (cf. Jer. ii, 13).

[2] *qualis est tuus intellectus*—of what kind is your understanding?

[3] *pro Se irascitur, non pro re sua. Aqua enim baptismatis res Dei est, non Deus.* Parmenian had taken *fons aquae vivae* to be true baptism, which Catholics had forsaken, whereas St. Optatus points out that it refers to God Himself.

[4] *baptizati*, i.e. rebaptised.

should be true that they who deserted your [baptism] came to us ? [1]

So we have shown that what you have said about the Sacraments and sacrifice of a sinner tells not against us, but against yourselves.

[1] *et si* [*vos* G] *putatis desertos esse, quando apud vos fuerunt, qui apud nos baptizati sunt, ut merito vestri desertores ad nos venire viderentur ?* (For, *apud vos fuerunt* BG read *apud nos fuerunt* ; for *qui apud nos* etc. RB read *quia* etc.) The Latin of this passage is obscure and the text not certain, but the argument of Optatus is clear. ' You say that we have deserted the font of true baptism, but, granted that you have true baptism, has your baptism ever been " deserted " by those that came over from you to us ? We have never rebaptised any who had received baptism at your hands.' *Viderentur* is (as so often in Optatus) used pleonastically.

# BOOK THE FIFTH

IN THIS FIFTH BOOK IT IS SHOWN THAT THOUGH MEN ARE THE MINISTERS OF BAPTISM, IT IS GOD WHO CLEANSES, AND THAT IT IS HIS CHRIST WHO GIVES WHAT IS RECEIVED IN BAPTISM, AND THAT THE REBAPTISED CANNOT POSSESS THE KINGDOM OF GOD, AND THAT THEY HAVE LOST THE WEDDING GARMENT.

I. From Parmenian's own principles it follows that Baptism is One.

IN our First Book we have shown by the clearest proofs who were the Betrayers of the Law [1] and the originators of the schism; in the Second we have pointed out that with us is the One True Catholic Church, whilst in the Third we have proved that whatever is said to have been done with severity cannot rightfully be in any way ascribed to us. We have also maintained [2] that there is divine warrant for saying that it is you,[3] rather than we, who are 'sinners.' [4]

We must now [5] in this place speak of Baptism. In the matter at present to be considered the whole

[1] *Legis*, id est, of the Holy Scriptures.

[2] *docuimus.* [3] *vos esse divino indicio.*

[4] *peccatores*—i.e. in the matter of the schism (cf. iv, 3 etc.).

[5] It will be noticed that in this summary of the preceding Books, there is no express reference to the Fourth. For this reason Casaubon thinks that the two lines which are now printed at the end of the Fourth ought to be placed at the beginning of this Fifth Book; *Probatum est ergo te non contra nos, sed contra vos dixisse, quod a te dictum est de oleo et sacrificio peccatoris.*

question consists in this, that you have dared to do violence[1] to Baptism—that you have repeated what Christ has commanded to be done but once.

And this, my brother Parmenian, you do not deny, since at the beginning of your treatise you have said many things which are on our side, and tell for us, but against you.[2] Thus with reference to Baptism, you have mentioned that there was only one Flood, and only one Circumcision for the people of the Jews. But although you dealt with these subjects at the beginning of your oration,[3] as the sermon was developed[4] you soon forgot all about them, and introduced two waters; so you made a silly commencement to your argument, for you knew that you were going on to discuss the true water and the false.[5]

You strengthen the oneness of Holy Baptism, when trying to weaken it[6]; for you have wished to lay as it were a foundation, with regard to the Jewish Circumcision, that the Baptism of Christians had been foreshadowed in the Circumcision of the Hebrews. In this way you have defended, whilst attacking, the Catholic Church. As your treatise progressed, you claimed to empty of value one kind of Baptism,[7] that you might fill the other to the full.[8] By saying

[1] *quod Baptisma vestra violavit audacia.*

[2] *multa contra vos pro nobis, quae sunt nostra, dixisti* (cf. i, 5).

[3] *dictionis tuae.* (*Dictio* is a formal piece of rhetoric.)

[4] *in processu tractatus tui. Tractatus* is usually a sermon (cf. p. 176, note 2).

[5] *de aqua vera et falsa.* [6] *infirmando confirmas.*

[7] That administered by Catholics.

[8] *alterum te inanire professus es, ut alterum replere videreris. Videor* is again used pleonastically.

that (apart from the Baptism of heretics [1]), there is one Baptism and yet a second,[2] you could not deny—although you have tried to show that they are different [3]—that they are two; when you endeavoured to remove one of these,[4] you laboured to treat the second [5] as though it were the first.[6] But before the coming of Baptism, Circumcision was sent forward in advance in a figure. Yet you have maintained that there are amongst Christians two waters. Show then that there are also two Circumcisions amongst the Jews—of which one was the better, the other the worse. If you search for this, you will not be able to find it. The family [7] of Abraham—by descent from whom men are judged to be Jews—glory in being marked with this seal. Therefore the truth ought afterwards to follow, like in character to its figure,[8] which was sent on before. For God too, who wished to show that the reality to come (when the truth should follow the type) must be something unique,[9]

[1] *extra haereticorum Baptisma.* By heretics St. Optatus here understands heretics such as Marcion, Praxeas and Valentinus (cf. iv, 5), who denied the doctrine of the Trinity. As they did not baptise in the Name of the Trinity, baptism administered by them was certainly invalid (cf. notes 1, p. 17; 2, p. 22). Of such *varia et falsa baptismata* (i, 12) there was to be no question in this Book. They lay outside its scope.

[2] *Baptisma alterum et alterum.*

[3] *diversa,* in the same way that Catholic Baptism differs from any baptism not administered in the Name of the Trinity.

[4] *auferre alterum,* id est, to deny the validity of Baptism by Catholics.

[5] id est, rebaptism by Donatists.

[6] *laborasti ut de secundo quasi primum facere videreris.* We have here once more a pleonastic use of *videor.*

[7] *prosapia.* [8] *eius imago.*

[9] *rem singularem post esse debere.*

willed not that anything should be removed from the ear, nor from the finger; but that part of the body was chosen where what had been once cut away[1] should leave them with a sign that is to our point, because it cannot be removed a second time. For when this is done once it preserves health; if done again it may do harm. Similarly, Christian Baptism, effected by the Trinity,[2] confers grace; if it be repeated it causes loss of life.

What then has come over you,[3] my brother Parmenian, to bring forward a thing which is one,[4] and over against it[5] to compare two Baptisms (even though you allege that they are different)—the one true, the other false? For in this way you have proceeded to argue that there are two waters, and claiming one as true for yourselves, wished to ascribe the other to us as false.[6]

After this you have made mention also of the Flood.[7] This was indeed a figure of Baptism, inasmuch as the whole sin-stained world, after the sinners had been drowned, was, through the intervention of washing,[8] restored—cleansed—to its former appearance.[9] But since you were going to say that (besides[10] the muddy[11] fountains of the heretics) there was another water—that is a lying[12] water in opposition to the

[1] *peritomen semel ablatum.* [2] *Trinitate confectum.*
[3] *quid tibi igitur placuit, frater Parmeniane?*
[4] *rem singularem.* [5] *contra hanc.*
[6] *mendacem.* [7] *Cataclysmi.*
[8] *lavacro interveniente.*
[9] *in faciem pristinam mundaretur.*
[10] *extra.* [11] *morbidos.*
[12] *mendacem.* The epithet applied by Donatists to Catholic Baptism.

true—to what purpose have you thought well to refer to the Flood, which happened but once? But as you will have it so,[1] show first two Arks unlike one another, and two dissimilar doves, bearing different branches in their mouth—that is, if you are to prove that there is a true water and another which is false.

That water alone is true which has been sanctified[2] not from any place, nor by any [human] person,[3] but by the Trinity. And, as you have said that there is a water which is lying,[4] learn where you may find such—with Praxeas, the Patripassian, who totally[5] denies the Son, and maintains that the Father has suffered.

Since the Son of God is Truth—as He Himself bears witness, saying:

'I am the Door, and the Way and the Truth'[6]—

therefore—if the Son of God is Truth—where He is not, there is a lie. And as the Son is not with the Patripassian, there the Truth is not, and where the Truth is not, there the water is lying. So, though late, cease now to concoct accusations,[7] and do not transfer to Catholics that which was said against Patripassians.

It has, then, been clearly demonstrated that what you have said of the Flood and of Circumcision might

[1] *si ita est.*
[2] *condita est.*
[3] *non de persona*, that is not (as the Donatists maintained) from the sanctity of the baptiser.
[4] *mendacem.*
[5] *ex toto.*
[6] John xiv, 6.
[7] *configere crimina.*

have been said just as well by us as in support of your side.[1]

It remains to show that you have praised Baptism in such a way as to bring forward many things which tell both for you and for us, but something that tells against you. Whatever we share with you is in favour of both. For this reason does it favour you, because from us you went out. Thus, for example, you and we have one ecclesiastical discipline,[2] we read from the same Scriptures,[3] we possess the same Faith, the same Sacraments of Faith, the same Mysteries. With reason, therefore, have you praised Baptism, for who amongst the Faithful is unaware that the one Baptism [4] is life for virtues, death to evil deeds,[5] birth to immortality, the attainment of the heavenly kingdom, the harbour of innocence, and (as you too have said) the shipwreck of sins [6]? These are the blessings conferred upon every believer, not by the minister of this Sacrament, but by the Faith of him who believes and by the Trinity.

II. That in Baptism the work is done by the Trinity, not by the person of the Minister.

Then you will ask what you have, when praising Baptism, said against yourselves. Listen! But first you must acknowledge something which not one of

[1] *a nobis et pro vobis.* G reads *pro nobis.* No doubt an emendation, to make the text less difficult.

[2] *conversatio* = manner of life.

[3] *communes lectiones* (St. Optatus, however, seems to contradict this in vi, 3, where he accuses the Donatists of having 'furtivas et alienas lectiones').

[4] *singulare baptisma.*

[5] *criminum mortem,*

[6] *peccatorum naufragium.*

you will be able to deny.[1] You say that the Trinity counts for nothing,[2] unless you be present.[3]

If you think little of us,[4] at least reverence the Lord, who is First in the Trinity,[5] who with His Son and the Holy Ghost effects and completes all things,[6] even when no human person is present.

But, my brother Parmenian, you have said in praise of the water, of which we read in the Book of Genesis, that the waters first gave forth living beings.[7] Could they have given them birth of their own instance[8]? Was not the whole Trinity there as well? Surely God the Father was there—He who had deigned to command:

> 'Let the waters bring forth swimming things, birds and the rest.'[9]

But if that which was then done were to be done without any to effect it,[10] God would have said:

> 'O waters, bring forth.'

[1] *quod omnes negare minime poteritis.*

[2] In Baptism.

[3] The Donatists held that the Invocation of the Trinity effected nothing in Baptism unless the Minister of the Sacrament was pure (*mundus*). But, as they taught that all the Catholics were impure (*inmundi*), it followed that they held practically that the Trinity could do nothing in Baptism unless they were present.

[4] *si nobis derogatis.*

[5] *qui in Trinitate prior est.* The reference is to Psalm cix, 1: 'Dixit Dominus Domino meo.'

[6] *omnia operatur et complet.*

[7] *aquas primum vivas animas edidisse.* Parmenian no doubt had before his mind the following words of Tertullian (*De Baptismo*): 'Primus liquor quod viveret edidit; nec mirum sit in Baptismo, si aquae animare noverunt.'

[8] *numquid sua sponte.*

[9] Gen. i, 20.

[10] *sine operante.*

So the Son of God—who effected it[1]—was there. The Holy Ghost was there, as it has been written:

'And the Spirit of God was borne over the waters.'[2]

I see nothing there which is a fourth—nothing less than the Three.[3] Yet that which the Trinity effected came to birth, although you were not there. If then it be not allowed to the Trinity to do anything without you, call back the fishes to their first beginning[4]; if in your absence the Trinity may not effect anything, drown in the waters the birds as they fly.

III. That Baptism is not to be repeated.

Since then you have said that there was only one Deluge and that Circumcision could not be repeated, whilst we have taught that the heavenly gift is bestowed upon every believer by the Trinity, not by man—why have you thought it right to repeat[5] Baptism not after us, but after the Trinity?

Concerning this Sacrament, no small contention has been engendered, and the question is discussed[6] whether it be lawful to do this a second time after the Trinity, in the Name of the same Trinity. You say:

'It is lawful,'

whilst we say:

'It is not lawful.'

Between your

'It is lawful,'

[1] *qui operabatur* (cf. John i, 3). [2] Gen. i, 2.
[3] *nihil minus a Tribus.* [4] *revocate pisces in originem.*
[5] *geminare* (cf. vi. 2: inmane facinus a vobis *geminatum* est; vi. 8: *geminata* fraude; vii. 6: salutatione *geminata*).
[6] *non leve certamen innatum est et dubitatur, an . . .*

and our

'It is not lawful,'

the souls of the multitude hesitate and sway backwards and forwards.[1] Let no one believe either you or us. We are all like litigants in a suit.[2] Judges must be sought for. If they are to be Christians, they cannot be provided by either side, because truth is impeded by party spirit.[3] A judge must be sought for from outside. If he is to be a Pagan, he cannot know the Christian secrets.[4] If he is to be a Jew, he is an enemy of Christian Baptism. Therefore, concerning this matter no judgement can be found on earth; we have to seek a Judge from heaven. But why need we knock at heaven's gate, when we have at hand in the Gospel a testament?

Here earthly things may with reason be compared with heavenly.[5] For example, in the case of any man who has many [6] sons, so long as the father is present, he himself gives his orders to each, nor is any testament necessary. Thus Christ, so long as He was present

[1] *nutant et remigant animae populorum.*

[2] *omnes contentiosi homines sumus.*

[3] *studiis veritas impeditur.* Cf. i, 26: 'de studio partium strepitus cotidiani sunt habiti.'

[4] *non potest Christiana nosse secreta.*

[5] Obviously this comparison cannot be unduly pressed. The Gospels cannot strictly be called Christ's Will, since not one word of them had been written at the time of His Death. St. Optatus, and St. Augustine after him (see note 2, p. 212), took advantage, for the purpose of their argument, of the word *Testamentum* (διαθήκη), which was already in use, though in a quite different sense, for the Sacred Books of the New Covenant. Dean Swift in his *Tale of a Tub* (Section II) is thought by some to have had this passage in his mind.

[6] *numerosos.*

on earth (although even now He is not absent), gave His orders to the Apostles with regard to whatever was necessary for the time. But just as an earthly father, who feels himself to be on the borderland of death, and fears lest his sons may break peace after his death, and go to law, calls in witnesses and transfers his will from his breast, so soon to pass away, to a record which will last for a long time [1]—and should any dispute arise amongst the brothers, they do not go to the grave, but the testament is looked for, and he who rests in the grave silently speaks from the record; in the same manner He, to whom the testament belongs, is in heaven—therefore let His Will be sought in the Gospel as in His testament.[2]

For through His foreknowledge Christ had foreseen the things which you do now, but which were

[1] *de pectore morituro transfert in tabulas diu duraturas.*

[2] Catholics have always appealed in domestic dissensions amongst themselves on theological questions, concerning which the Church has not spoken authoritatively, to the testimony of (1) Holy Scripture, (2) Apostolic Tradition. In dissensions with heretics they have appealed to the testimony of Scripture, which heretics profess at least to accept. So St. Augustine in controversy with the Donatists makes the same appeal, and indeed uses the same words as St. Optatus: 'Fratres sumus; quare litigamus? Non intestatus mortuus est Pater; fecit testamentum et sic mortuus est . . . Sedet Christus in caelo, et contradicitur Eius testamento' (*in Ps.* xxi). But St. Augustine makes this appeal with greater caution than did St. Optatus. St. Optatus in the text appeals to John xiii, 7, in order to prove that Baptism may not be repeated; whereas St. Augustine, who no doubt felt that this was a forced application (cf. *con. Petil.* ii, 22) of the text, prefers to press the appeal to Scripture in order to prove thereby that the Catholic Church is the one Church of Christ. This he does without ceasing, urging the authority of the Catholic Church as decisive. When the discussion concerns any particular question (e.g. the repetition of Baptism) St. Augustine prefers to appeal to Apostolic Tradition rather than to Holy Scripture (cf. *De Unit.* xix; *De Bapt.* ii, 7, iv, 6, v, 23).

then yet to come. Accordingly, when the Son of God washed the feet of His disciples, He spoke thus to Peter:

'That which I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know afterwards.'[1]

By saying 'thou shalt know afterwards' He pointed out these present times. In this way amongst other prescriptions of His testament,[2] He gave this prescription[3] concerning the Water. If, when He washed the feet of His disciples, and the others were silent, Peter had also been silent, He would have set the example of humility only,[4] and would have made no declaration respecting the Sacrament of Baptism. But when Peter refuses, and does not allow his feet to be washed, Christ refuses him the Kingdom, unless he should accept this service.[5] But so soon as there is mention of the heavenly Kingdom—whereas part of his body was demanded to have service rendered unto it—he offered his whole body to be cleansed.[6]

Now come, be present, ye crowds and all Christian peoples,[7] and learn what is lawful. When Peter makes his appeal,[8] Christ teaches. Let him who doubts learn. For it is the Voice of Christ:

'He, who has once been washed, has no need of being washed again, for he is altogether clean.'[9]

[1] John xiii, 8. [2] *inter ceteros Testamenti titulos.*
[3] *hunc titulum.* [4] *solam formam humilitatis.* [5] *obsequium.*
[6] *quo pars corporis petebatur ad obsequium, totum corpus obtulit ad lavacrum.*
[7] *nunc adestote, omnes turbae et singuli Christiani populi.*
[8] *dum provocat Petrus.* [9] *mundus totus,* John xiii, 10.

And thus did He make His declaration concerning that washing [1] which he had commanded to be done through the Trinity [2]—not concerning that of Jews or heretics, who, whilst they wash, defile,[3] but concerning the holy water which flows from the fountains of the Three Names.[4]

For thus the Lord Himself commanded, when He said :

'Go, baptise all nations in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' [5]

This was the washing [6] of which He said :

'He that has been washed once has no need of being washed a second time.'

In saying *once* He forbade it to be done again, and spoke of the thing, not of the person.[7] For if there had been a difference [8] [to be considered between persons], He would have said :

'He that has been rightly [9] washed once,'

but by not adding the word *rightly*, He points out that whatever has been done in the [Name of the] Trinity is done rightly. This is the reason why we receive without rebaptising [10] those who come [to us] from you. When Christ says :

[1] *de eo lavacro.* [2] *de Trinitate.*
[3] *qui dum lavant, sordidant.*
[4] *quo de Trium Nominum fontibus inundat.* Cf. note 3, p. 88.
[5] Matt. xxviii, 19. [6] *de hoc lavacro dixit*
[7] *de re locutus est non de persona* (sc. the Minister of the Sacrament).
[8] *distantia.* (Cf. v, 4 infra : 'vos vultis eiusdem personae esse *distantiam.*')
[9] *bene.* [10] *simpliciter.*

'He has no need of being washed a second time,'

this is a general, not a particular declaration,[1] for if these things had been said to Peter [only], Christ would have said :

'Because thou hast been once washed, thou hast no need of being washed a second time.'

Wherefore, whenever anyone who has been baptised by you wishes to pass over to us, we, taught by this command and example, receive him with all simplicity.[2]

For far be it from us[3] ever to exorcise one of the Faithful who has been made whole[4]; far be it from us to bring back to the font one who has been already washed,[5] far from us to sin against the Holy Ghost—an offence for which forgiveness is denied in this world and in the world to come[6]; far from us to repeat[7] that which is [to be done] only once,[8] or to make twofold[9] that which is one. For thus has it been written by the Apostle :

'One God, one Christ, one Faith, one Baptism.[10]'

Do you then, who seem to take delight[11] in striving

[1] *haec sententia generalis est non specialis.*
[2] *venientem hoc magisterio et exemplo tota simplicitate suscipimus.*
[3] *absit.* [4] *sanum fidelem.*
[5] *ut iam lotum revocemus ad fontem.* It may be noted that in the Catholic Church to-day, whenever a convert has to be conditionally baptised, in consequence of some doubt as to the 'Matter' and 'Form' of his Baptism outside the Church (e.g. as to whether it was *in Trinitate*), this ceremony does not take place at the font, but elsewhere in privacy.
[6] Cf. Matt. xii, 31–32; Mark iii, 28–29; Luke xii, 10.
[7] *iteremus.* [8] *quod semel est.* [9] *duplicemus.*
[10] *una tinctio* (cf. Eph. iv, 5).
[11] *quasi libenter duplicare contenditis.*

to make Baptism twofold, if you give a second Baptism, give a second Faith ; if you give a second Faith, give also a second Christ ; if you give a second Christ, give a second God ?

You cannot deny that God is one—unless indeed you would fall into the traps of Marcion.[1] God then is one. Of one God there is one Christ.[2] He who is rebaptised had before been made a Christian. How can he be said to become a Christian a second time ? [3]

The one Faith is thus separated from the errors of the heretics, and the one only Faith from their varying faith.[4] It has also a prescriptive right over against you,[5] who reject that which is for once only, attributing everything to the [external] Endowments, nothing to the [hidden] Sacraments [6] ; though this quality of Faith [7] belongs to the believer, not to the 'Minister.' [8] For he who has believed in God at the interrogation

[1] *in Marcionis foveas* (cf. iv, 5 ; i, 9).

[2] *De uno Deo unus est Christus.*

[3] A man who has been born once, either in the natural or supernatural order, cannot be born again in the same order of things.

[4] *una fides ab haereticorum erroribus, et ab eorum varia fide fides unica separatur.*

[5] *etiam vobis praescribitur*, i.e. the first Baptism is 'in possession.' Cf. infra : *quod praescribat praesumptionibus vestris.*

[6] *totum ponendo in dotibus, nihil in Sacramentis* (cf. ii, 10, where the thought is more fully developed : 'Cur de solis ecclesiae dotibus loqui voluisti et iam illud respondeas et de sanctis eius membris ac visceribus tacuisti, quae sunt procul dubio in Sacramentis et in Nominibus Trinitatis ? ').

[7] *hoc nomen fidei.* St. Optatus writes of *Nomen Christianum* (iii, 8) ; *Catholicum* (iii, 1) ; *Ecclesiae* (i, 21 ; iii, 5) ; *Baptismatis* (v, 4) ; *Traditorum* (i, 28) ; *Legis* (vii, 1) ; *fraternitatis* (i, 3) ; *pietatis* (iii, 10) ; *communionis* (vii, 6).

[8] *pertineat ad credentem, non ad operantem* (i.e. minister of the Sacrament).

of any person whomsoever,[1] has believed. Yet after his one *Credo* thou dost exact a second *Credo*.[2]

It follows then that Baptism is one, and, as, through the very fact that it is one, it is holy, so also, through the very fact that it is one, not only that it should be separated from the profane and sacrilegious baptisms of heretics, but also that what is one should not be made twofold, and that what is for once only should not be repeated.

IV. That it is God, not the Minister, who cleanses in the Sacrament of Baptism.

It is clear that in the celebration of this Sacrament of Baptism there are three elements,[3] which you will not be able either to decrease or diminish, or put on one side. The first is in the Trinity, the second in the believer,[4] the third in him who operates.[5] But they must not all be weighed by the same measure.[6] For I perceive that two are necessary, and that one is quasi-necessary.[7] The Trinity holds the chief place, without whom the work itself cannot be done. The faith of the believer follows next. Then comes the office of the 'Minister,'[8] which cannot be of equal

[1] *quocumque enim interrogante, qui credidit Deo, credidit.*

[2] *post illius unum 'Credo,' tu exigis alterum 'Credo.'* The reference is to the baptismal interrogatories.

[3] *species.* Literally *aspects, points of view.*

[4] *in credente* (the subject of the Sacrament).

[5] *in operante* (the minister of the Sacrament).

[6] *non pari libramine ponderandae sunt singulae.*

[7] *quasi necessaria.* Cf. 'quasi ecclesia' (iii, 10). 'Contingently necessary' is Mr. Sparrow Simpson's translation (*op. cit.* p. 47). It conveys the idea that the appointment of a Minister in Baptism is not absolutely necessary in itself, but contingent on the Will of God. I doubt, however, whether this thought was before the mind of Optatus. His argument proceeds, as we shall see immediately, on somewhat different lines.

[8] *persona operantis.* *Persona* from the part played by an actor

authority. The first two remain always unchangeable and unmoved. For the Trinity is always Itself; and the Faith is the same in everyone.[1] Both [the Trinity and Faith] always preserve their own efficacy. It will be seen, therefore, that the office of the minister [2] cannot be equal to the other two elements [3] [in the Sacrament of Baptism], because it alone is liable to change.

You will have it that between you and us there is a distinction, though the office is the same,[4] and, judging yourselves to be more holy than we, you do not hesitate to place your pride higher than the Trinity,[5] although the person of the 'Minister' can be changed, but the Trinity cannot be changed. And, whereas it is Baptism which should be longed for by those who receive it, you put yourselves forward as the persons to be eagerly sought after.

Since you are—amongst others—'Ministers' of the Sacrament, show what is the nature of the place that you occupy in this Mystery, and whether you can belong to its 'body'!

The Name of Baptism is but one.[6] It possesses

= here the duty which the 'minister' has to perform—the official work assigned to him.

[1] *fides in singulis una est.* [2] *persona operantis.*

[3] *duabus prioribus speciebus par esse non posse.*

[4] *eiusdem personae esse distantiam. Persona*, sc. operantis (v. supra). In the administration of Baptism, whether Peter baptises or Judas, there can be no real *distantia*. For *distantia*, as used by Optatus, cf. v, 3: Nam si esset *distantia* (i.e. *personae*, as here); i, 10 (*inter schismaticos et haereticos*); i, 21 (*delictorum*, i.e. *inter delicta*).

[5] For they attributed the efficacy of Baptism, not to the work of the Trinity, but to their own sanctity.

[6] *Baptismatis unicum nomen est.* There is only one Baptism. (Cf. *Singulare Baptisma*, passim.)

its own *body*[1]—a body which has its own well-defined members,[2] to which nothing can be added, in which nothing can be taken away. If the 'Minister' who has to be chosen is counted as one of these members,[3] then the whole body belongs to the 'Minister.' All these members are both at all times and once for all with this 'body,' and cannot be changed, whereas the 'Ministers' are changed every day, both as to place and time, and in their own persons.[4] For it is not one man only, who baptises always or everywhere. This work is now done by different men from those who did it of old. In the time to come it will be done by yet others. The 'Ministers' can be changed; the Sacraments cannot be changed. Since therefore you see that all who baptise are labourers, not lords,[5]

[1] *cui subest proprium corpus.*

[2] *cui corpori certa sunt membra.* That which we now call the *Matter and Form* of the Sacrament.

[3] i.e. of the 'body' of Baptism. The 'Minister' has to be chosen, and consequently is external to the 'body' of Baptism. This reminds us of the converse argument that *Umbilicus* cannot be reckoned as one of the Endowments, because it is not external to the Body of the Church, but is a member (*membrum*) of that Body (ii, 8). Evidently St. Optatus looked on the Minister in Baptism as a sort of '*Dos Baptismatis.*'

[4] The water, the invocation of the Trinity, the Trinity Itself, the Faith never change. They are always one everywhere and are always necessary—from the first Christian Baptism to the last that shall be administered before the coming of our Lord. Everything else admits of change—the place, the time, the person of the 'Minister.'

[5] *operarios esse non dominos.* The reference clearly is to Luke x, 2: 'Rogate *Dominum* messis ut mittat *operarios* in messem suam,' where Challoner's N.T. and both the A.V. and R.V. translate *operarios* '*labourers*' (the old Rheims has *workmen*). Consequently I think it better to employ the word *labourers* here in order to recall the gospel text, though elsewhere, for the sake of lucidity, I translate *operarius* with reference to Baptism by the theological word *Minister.*

and that the Sacraments are holy through themselves, not through men,[1] why do you claim so much for yourselves? Why is it that you try to shut God out from His own gifts? Allow Him to bestow those things, which are His own. For that gift, which belongs to God, cannot be given by man. If you think otherwise, you are endeavouring to make of no effect the words of the Prophets and the promises of God, by which it is proved that it is God, not man, who cleanses. Here David the Prophet is against you, for he says in the fiftieth Psalm:

'Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be cleansed beyond the snow'[2];

and again in the same Psalm:

'O God, wash me from my wickedness and cleanse me from my sin.'[3]

[1] *Sacramenta per se esse sancta, non per homines.* Harnack writes of these words (*History of Dogma*, v, p. 42): 'This is the famous principle of the objectivity of the Sacraments, which became so fundamental for the development of the dogmatics of the Western Church, although it could not be carried out in all its purity in the Roman Church, because in that case it would have destroyed the prerogatives of the clergy.' It is difficult to see what Harnack had in his mind when he wrote this last qualifying sentence. Nothing can be more certain than that the Roman Church has always taught, without any limitation or qualification whatsoever, that the efficacy of the Sacraments is always and everywhere independent of the virtues or vices of those who administer them. Harnack in this passage probably used the words *Roman Church* as synonymous with *Western Church* (although this would not appear to be the case at first reading), since he would not wish to suggest that there is any difference in doctrine or practice between any Catholic Church in the West and the Church in Rome. But whilst recognising this, we are none the nearer to a comprehension of his real meaning.

[2] Ps. l, 9. [3] Ps. l, 4.

He said: 'Wash me.' He did not say:

'Choose for me one by whom I may be washed.'

And the Prophet Isaiah also has written that

'the Lord shall wash away the defilement of the sons and daughters of Sion.'[1]

We have proved in our Third Book that Sion is the Church[2]; it follows that God washes the sons and daughters of the Church. He did not say:

'They shall wash who judge themselves to be holy.'

Admit then that the Prophets overcome you, or, with them, recognise that it is not man who washes, but God.

As long as you ask:

'How can he give, who has not anything to give?'[3]

understand that it is the Lord who is the giver,[4] understand that it is God who cleanses each man, whoever he may be; for no one can wash away the defilement and stains of the mind, but God alone, who is also the Maker of the mind.[5] Or, if you think that

[1] Is. iv, 4. [2] iii, 2.

[3] '*qui non habet quod det, quomodo dat?*' This was the great argument of St. Cyprian and his school against the validity of Baptism outside the Church. 'How,' they asked, 'can a man give the Faith which he has not got? No one can give what he has not.' In like manner the Donatists went on to argue that Baptism by a sinner was invalid, for—so they urged—by true Baptism grace is given; but the sinner without grace cannot give what he has not. To this St. Optatus answers that it is God, not man, who bestows gifts in Baptism.

[4] *videte Dominum esse datorem.* These words are omitted by RBv.

[5] *qui eiusdem fabricator est mentis.*

it is your washing[1] [that cleanses], tell us what is the nature of this mind,[2] which is washed through the body, or what 'form'[3] it has, or in what part of a man it dwells. To know this has not been granted to any. How, then, do you think that it is you who cleanse, when you do not know the nature of that which you cleanse? It belongs not to man, but to God to cleanse, for He has Himself promised that He will cleanse, through the Prophet Isaiah, when He said:

'Even though your sins are like scarlet, I will make you white as snow.'[4]

He said:

'I will make you white,'

and not:

'I will cause you to be made white.'

If this has been promised by God, why do you wish to give that which it is not permitted to you either to promise, or to give, or to have? Behold by Isaiah God has promised Himself to wash those stained by sin, not through a man.[5]

Go back to the Gospel, and see what Christ has promised for the salvation of the human race. When

[1] *lavacrum vestrum.* [2] *qualis est ipsa mens.*
[3] *quam habet formam.* [4] Is. i, 18.
[5] As St. Optatus has said already, man is by God's appointment the necessary (or rather the *quasi-necessary*) minister of the Sacrament. But God gives His Grace in Baptism *directly* to the baptised. He does not give it *through a man*—that is to say, He does not give it first to the 'Minister,' making him holy, so that this 'Minister,' by his own holiness, gives grace—though this would follow logically from Donatist principles.

the Samaritan woman refused water to the Son of God, then He said that which gives His answer to your contentions [1]:

'He who shall drink the water which I give shall not thirst for ever.' [2]

He said:

'the water which *I* give.'

He did not say:

'which *they* shall give, *who deem themselves holy*,'

as you think yourselves to be; but He did say that *He* would give. He Himself, therefore, it is who gives, and that which is given is His own. What, therefore, is it which you strive, with absolute unreasonableness,[3] to vindicate for yourselves?

V. Why and when the Baptism of Christ was conferred.

To give the final proof concerning this matter, John the Baptist, the forerunner of the Saviour, when he was baptising many to repentance and the remission of their sins,[4] declared that the Son of God was about to come. These are his words:

'Behold, He cometh to baptise you.' [5]

Yet we do not read that Christ rebaptised anyone after John. With regard, therefore, to these words:

'He cometh to baptise you,'

Christ coming after John baptised no one. This

[1] *quod praescribat praesumptionibus vestris.*
[2] John iv, 13.
[3] *tota inportunitate.* For *inportunitas* see ii, 18.
[4] *in poenitentia et remissa peccatorum* (cf. i, 9: in remissam peccatorum).
[5] John i, 33.

promise was made for our times, that He might give what is given to-day, according to His Word :

'He who shall drink the water which I give shall not thirst for ever.'

And although the disciples of John said to their master :

'Behold He, whom thou hast baptised, baptises.'[1]

He baptised indeed, but by the hands of His Apostles, to whom He had given the laws of Baptism. As it has been written in another place :

'For He Himself baptised no one, but His disciples baptised.'[2]

In this matter we are all His disciples, so that we should work,[3] in order that He may give, who promised that He would give. Still, when John was baptising many[4] thousands of men, even in the presence of Christ, the servant worked, and the Lord did nothing[5] until He gave the Form of Baptism.[6] After the lapse of a considerable period,[7] thousands of men were washed in repentance and forgiveness of sins. But no one was washed in the Trinity, no one yet knew Christ, no one had heard that there was a Holy Ghost. But when there came the fullness of time, at a fixed moment, the

[1] Cf. John iii, 26. [2] John iv, 2.

[3] *ut nos operemur.*

[4] *infinita millia* (cf. iii, 6: sub Iohanne infinita multitudo hominum baptizata est).

[5] *operabatur servus et vacabat Dominus.* There is a specific distinction between the Baptism of John and the Baptism of Christ. (Cf. v. 5 : alterum fuerit baptisma Iohannis et alterum sit Christi.)

[6] *antequam baptizandi daret formam.*

[7] *peractum est non modicum tempus* Gb, *per acceptum non modicum tempus* RBv. Ziwsa has suggested *per actum non modicum tempus.*

Son of God gave the laws of Baptism. He gave also the way by which we might go to the Kingdom of Heaven, for He then commanded :

'Go ye, teach all nations, baptising them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'[1]

From that day what He had commanded had to be done. It was not His will to amend that which had been done before that time, lest He might [seem to] give permission to rebaptise—although the Baptism of John was one thing, and the Baptism of Christ is another. Before His law [was given] He willed the Baptism of John, which was not full, to be held for full. And yet with regard to the thousands of men mentioned above, although they knew not the Son of God and the Holy Ghost, He could not refuse them the Kingdom of Heaven, because they had believed in God. So it is the Voice of the Son of God, who says :

'From the days of John to this day the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and they who do violence bear it away.'[2]

For this reason does He say :

'They who do violence,'[3]

because John was still baptising. So, because the time before His commandments[4] was different from the time after His commandments, they who have been baptised in the Name of the Saviour after the commandments,[5] have entered the Kingdom, through

[1] Matt. xxviii, 19.
[2] Matt. xi, 12.
[3] *qui vim faciunt.*
[4] *ante praecepta,* sc. de Baptismate.
[5] *post praecepta.*

the laws[1] [of Baptism], whilst those who were before the commandments did violence,[2] without the law, but were not shut out. Therefore, though before the commandments,[3] the Baptism of John was imperfect, it was judged by Him, in whose place no man judges,[4] as though it were perfect,[5] because a certain line of division[6] was placed between the times that preceded and those that followed His command.[7]

When the most blessed Paul saw some at Ephesus who had been baptised, after the commandments[8] [of Christ], in the Baptism of John, he asked them whether they had received the Holy Ghost.[9] They replied that they did not know whether there was a Holy Ghost, and he said to them that, after the Baptism of John, they must receive the Holy Ghost.

They had been baptised, in the same manner[10] as had been the many whom John had baptised. But those who had been baptised before the law,[11] belonged to the time of exemption,[12] for He had been present who could give exemption. Those who were not bound

[1] *in Regnum legibus intraverunt.* [2] *vim fecerunt.*
[3] *ante praecepta.* [4] *cui nemo iudicat.*
[5] *pro perfecto iudicatum est.*
[6] *quasi quidam limes.* Ziwsa says that *limes* = *terminus.*
[7] *iussionis inter tempora antecedentia et sequentia.* St. Optatus held that the Baptism of John conferred grace before the institution of Christian Baptism, but not afterwards. From this it follows that anyone who had received the Baptism of John *after* the institution of Christian Baptism had to receive the Baptism of Christ. This he proceeds to deduce from Acts xix, 1 *seq.*
[8] *post praecepta.* [9] *an accepissent Spiritum Sanctum.*
[10] *sic . . . quemadmodum*, i.e. even without any knowledge of the Mystery of the Trinity.
[11] *ante legem*, sc. Baptismatis.
[12] *ad indulgentiam pertinuerunt.*

by the laws[1] were altogether not guilty.[2] But those who, as we read, were baptised at Ephesus with the Baptism of John after the law,[3] had after the laws[4] erred in the Sacrament,[5] because the Baptism of the Lord had now been introduced and the Baptism of the servant had been abrogated.[6] And so it is that, after the divine commands,[7] men had to go into the Kingdom by laws,[8] not by violence.[9] For Christ had already fixed the limit of time by saying :

> 'From the days of John until to-day.'[10]

After 'to-day' that which was lawful yesterday was lawful no longer. Wherefore do not deceive yourselves[11] with the saying of the Apostle Paul,[12] for he did not ask about the person of the 'Minister,' but about the thing.[13] With the fact, not with the person, he was dissatisfied. So he commanded the Baptism of the Saviour, that they who did not know might learn, for this[14] they had not received, but something different. But what do *you* change? If you have been able to change *things*,[15] you will have

[1] *legibus* (sc. Baptismatis) *non occupati.* [2] *non erant ex toto rei.*
[3] *post legem,* sc. Baptismatis. [4] *post leges,* sc. Baptismatis.
[5] *in Sacramento erraverant.* [6] *exclusum fuerat.*
[7] *post mandata divina,* sc. de Baptismate.
[8] *legibus* (sc. Baptismatis) *debuerant ire in regnum.*
[9] *non per violentiam.* [10] Matt. xi, 12.
[11] *nolite vobis blandiri.* [12] At Ephesus.
[13] *non post personam operarii interrogavit, sed post rem* (cf. v, 3). St. Paul did not enquire as to the character of him who had administered the Sacrament, but as to the fact whether its recipients had received the Holy Ghost.
[14] *non ipsum,* sc. Baptisma Salvatoris.
[15] *res.* With a reference to that which he has just written of St. Paul enquiring not about the *persona,* but about the *res.*

done well, provided you have acted according to the Law.[1] Paul said:

'In what Baptism have you been baptised?'[2]

and they said to him:

'The Baptism of John.'

He persuaded them to receive the Baptism of Christ. *You* do not say:

'*What* have you received?'

but

'*From whom* have you received it?'

and you inveigh against the characters of men, and wish to repeat what is for once only. They who had been baptised at Ephesus, had believed in repentance and the forgiveness of sins. Rightly was it said to them, that they should be baptised in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. But what is there for you to change in men, who have already made profession[3] that they believe in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost?[4] Whether you ask them this again, or some-

[1] *si tamen de lege aliquid feceritis.* By the law is here still meant Christ's Law concerning Baptism. If the Donatists had put right any baptisms, which had not been validly administered, they had done well; e.g. if they had baptised any persons who had received a baptism, but not in the Name of the Trinity. Such, however, was not the case.

[2] Acts xix, 3.

[3] In their Baptism.

[4] Parmenian had urged that Baptism given outside the Church was null and must be repeated, because those baptised by the Baptist were baptised anew by the Apostles. Optatus answers that the cases are not parallel. The same reply is given by Augustine, *con. Petil.* ii, 37, iii, 56; *De Bapt.* v, 9, 10 etc.

thing else, be convinced that you must sin—if you either interrogate concerning that which has not been commanded, or wish to do something which has been done already.

VI. An answer to the argument, that a man cannot give that which he has not.

I return now to that question of yours :

'How is he, who has not anything to give, able to give ?'

Whence comes this saying ? Where can it be found ? It has not been read in a book, but has been brought in from the street.[1]

'How is he, who has not anything to give, able to give ?'

These words have not been written in the Law, for if (as you will have it) it is man who gives, God does nothing—and if God does nothing, and if everything that has to be given is in your hands, then [the baptised] are converted to you. Let those whom you baptise be washed in your name. Blush at the most blessed Paul, who cries out and expresses his thanksgiving :

'Have you been baptised in my name ?'[2]

He rejoices that he baptised only two persons and one household, but you strive to rebaptise whole peoples, and are contented[3] both to have sinned in the past, and to go on sinning, saying :

'What does he give, who has not anything to give ?'

[1] *vox est de vico conlecta, non de libro lecta.* A mere catchword without any real authority. It is impossible to express in English the verbal antithesis between *conlecta* and *lecta.*

[2] 1 Cor. i, 13. [3] *gaudetis.*

He, in whom we believe, is Himself the giver of that in which we believe, not another through whose instrumentality we are brought to believe.[1] Besides, under John a vast [2] multitude of men were baptised. Prove (if you can) that John either received, or possessed, anything to give.

He was the 'Minister' [3]; the gift was from God, who does not fail in giving. And now whilst we all are Ministers of Baptism, the works are man's, but the gifts are from God.[4]

VII. That the Grace of Baptism is the gift of God, not of man, who is shown to be only the Minister.

So consider how ridiculous is that saying, which is always heard to come from you, as though for your glorification:

'This gift of Baptism belongs to him who gives, not to him who receives.' [5]

And would that you should say this of God, who is the true Giver.[6] But—a stupid thing—you say that you are the givers. If this be so, suppose that both you and we are dealing with two Pagans.[7] Do you, who say that you are holy, ask the one whom you have in your hands,[8] whether he renounces the Devil and believes the Lord, and we will suppose that he says:

'I will not.' [9]

[1] *cui creditur ipse dat, quod creditur, non per quem creditur.*
[2] *infinita.* [3] *illo operante.*
[4] *humana sunt opera, sed Dei sunt munera.*
[5] *hoc munus baptismatis esse dantis, non accipientis.*
[6] *qui huius rei dator est.*
[7] *et nos et vos teneamus singulos gentiles.* Cf. i, 8: nihil interesset inter fideles et unumquemque gentilem.
[8] *quem tenetis.* [9] '*nolo.*'

On the other hand, let us who, as you will have it, are sinners, ask the other Pagan, whether he renounces the Devil, and believes God and the other questions, and we will suppose that he says :

'I do renounce and I do believe, and the rest'[1]—

will you tell me when you baptise the one who is unwilling, and we baptise the other who is willing, which of these two can arrive at the grace of God ?

Surely, without doubt, it is acquired by the one who believes, not by him, in whose case, as you say, your holiness takes the place of his own will.[2] Recognise, though late, that you are only ministers. Or if (you say that) the work is in the workmen, and not in itself, find some who will claim this for themselves in their arts, so that we may, according to your challenge, compare human arts with things that are divine.

When something is dyed with a precious colour, its nature is often changed. A white fleece is dyed, and becomes purple.[3] Even as the white wool passes into the royal purple, so the catechumen passes into the Christian.[4] Surely, whilst he begins to be that which he was not, he ceases to be that which he was. The wool changes both its colour and its name, and the man changes both his appellation and his

[1] '*renuntio et credo*' *et cetera.*

[2] *non ille, pro cuius voluntate, ut dicitis, sanctitas vestra succedit.* For *succedit* cf. i, 3 : 'Petrus, cui successit Linus,' etc. In *pro cuius voluntate* we have another curious example of Optatus' use of pronouns. Cf. v, 5 : 'Qui non *post* personam operarii interrogavit.'

[3] *confectione vellus candidum purpurascit.* Cf. Cic. *in Acad. ap. Non.* 2, 717 : 'Nonne unda, cum est pulsa remis, purpurascit ?'

[4] *fidelem.*

disposition.[1] We have to think of the results that have been effected, and must consider once more what it is that has effected those results.[2] You say that it is your gift that has made that man a Christian.

If this is all your doing, then the workman also who makes the purple, may say that he has the precious colour in his own hands, and has no need to procure from the Ocean precious dyes—unknown to many—that the fleeces may be promoted to a marvellous dignity,[3] and is free to assert that he can make the purple, merely by his touch, without admixture from the blood of the fish.

But if on the contrary this workman is unable to give the colour by his touch alone, then neither is the workman in Baptism able to give anything of himself without the Trinity.

Such is this question, about which we have our present contention. For in Whom the nations should be baptised has been ordained by the Saviour. Through whom they should be baptised was appointed without the making of any exception. He did not say to the Apostles:

'Do it you! Let not others do it.'

Whosoever has baptised in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, has discharged the Apostles' work.

And so it has been written in the Gospel.[4] When John said:

[1] *et vocabulum mutat et mentem.*

[2] *consideranda sunt effecta, retractanda sunt efficientia.*

[3] *quibus tincta vellera per colorem promoveantur in admirabilem dignitatem.*

[4] Luke ix, 49.

'O Master, we have seen one casting out devils in Thy Name, and we have forbidden him, because he followeth not with us,'

Christ said:

'Forbid him not, for he that is not against you is for you.'[1]

For to them the command had been given that their work should be sanctification by the Trinity,[2] and that they should not baptise in their own name, but in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Therefore it is the Name which sanctifies, not the work.[3]

Understand, though late in the day, that you are labourers not lords.[4] And, if the Church is the Vineyard, and men are the vines, and those who are to attend to the vines have been duly appointed, why do you rush upon that which appertains to the dominion of the Father of the Family? Why do you claim for yourselves what belongs to God? Why do you wish that something of which you cannot have even a part, should be yours altogether? For on account of swelling pride—yours—with which you are swollen against us[5]—the most blessed Paul chides the

[1] Luke ix, 49, 50.

[2] *ut opus esset illorum sanctificatio Trinitatis.*

[3] *ergo Nomen est, quod sanctificat, non opus.*

[4] *operarios esse non dominos.* Cf. note 2, p. 22.

[5] *nam propter tumorem vestrum, quo in nos intumescitis.* We may notice the verbal alliteration *tumorem . . . intumescitis.* St. Optatus does not, of course, mean to imply that St. Paul any more than Isaiah or Ezekiel had received a supernatural gift of prophecy, whereby Apostle or Prophet could *consciously to himself* foresee and provide medicine for the troubles brought on by Donatism. But the lessons given for all time by the Sacred Writers seemed to Optatus especially applicable to his own days.

Corinthians. In himself and Apollo he gives a picture of that which happens in our time.[1]

'Let not one,' he said, 'be puffed up against another.'[2]

And, that he may show how all this Sacrament of Baptism belongs to God, so that there is nothing here that the 'Minister' may claim for himself, he speaks as follows:[3]

'I indeed have planted'—

that is,

'of a pagan I have made a catechumen'—'Apollo has watered'—

that is, he has baptised the catechumen, but God has given that which had been planted, or watered, the power to grow. In like manner anyone to-day, who wishes to dig up and loosen the ground in his vineyard,[4] hires a labourer[5] for an agreed sum, to make holes in the ground, in which—with bent back, the sweat running down his sides—he may place the little vines that have been selected,[6] and (after he has trodden the ridges under his feet) pour water upon them. He is able to dig at the trenches and plant the vines. He is able to bring them water, but he is not able to command the water to hold them[7]; it is in the power of God

[1] *in se et Apollo actus nostri temporis conformat.*
[2] 1 Cor. iv, 6.
[3] 1 Cor. iii, 6.
[4] *vineam suam pastinare.*
[5] *operarium.*
[6] *electa plantaria.*
[7] *aquam inducere potest; imperare, ut teneat, non potest.* It is very difficult to understand what is meant here by *ut teneat.* How can water hold the vines? Possibly *he* may be the subject of *teneat*: 'He cannot command the vines, so as to keep them there.' If for *teneat* we read *teneant*, we might translate in an intransitive sense:

alone from the pith of vine-branches to bring forth roots which assimilate themselves to the soil, and the budding eyelets, out of which leaves burst forth.[1]

Even as the blessed Apostle Paul, to tame your presumption and pride, and that the workman [2] may not think either that he has any dominion over Baptism, or claim any share for himself—however small—in so great a gift, writes as follows, showing that all belongs to God :

'Neither he that plants nor he that waters is anything, but God alone, who leads to the attainment of the increase [3].'

You are workmen amongst others. When the sun goes in,[4] that is to say, when the world has come to an

'He cannot order that they hold' = *coalescere in terram* (infra). But nothing is really satisfactory. Casaubon thinks that the *ut teneat* is probably a corrupt gloss due to some scribe who could not understand the *imperare* standing alone. The meaning is clear. It is God alone who can ripen the vine. Casaubon suggests that if St. Optatus wrote anything between *imperare* and *non potest*, it was *vineae*. On the other hand, cf. iv, 9 : *Lacus detritos, qui non possunt aquam continere*. St. Optatus, who often slightly varies his phrases, may have had this phrase unconsciously lingering in his ear.

[1] *de medullis palmitum producere radices coalescentes in terram et gemmantes oculos, incrementa frondium provocare. Coalescentes* : cf. Plin. xiv. 2 : 'Ut nisi pinguissimo solo *coalescere* non possit.' The little feelers or feeling roots must be one with the soil. *Gemmantes oculos* : cf. Cicero, *De oratore*, iii. 38 : '*gemmare* vites, laetas segetes etiam rustici dicunt,' 'Even rustics understood and used such metaphors as these.' *Oculos* = the knob from which the bud rises; cf. Columel. iv, 29 : 'Interest plures *oculos*, quibus egerminet inesse.'

[2] *operarius*. [3] *qui ad incrementa perducit*. Cf. 1 Cor. iii, 7.

[4] *sole intrante*. This is a Hebraism. The Jews spoke of the setting sun as entering (into the heavens), and of the rising sun as coming forth (from the East).

end—on the Judgement Day[1]—you may argue with us about reward.[2]

Do not wish to claim for yourself that which belongs to the supreme authority of God.[3] For if this is your due, then the servants who wait at the Lord's table should claim to be thanked by His guests for the courtesies which their Lord has rendered.[4] It is the Voice of Christ, who gives the invitation:

'Come, ye blessed of My Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.'[5]

The nations flock to receive His grace. He, who deigned to invite, is the giver thereof. A crowd of His servants exercise their ministry. Thanks must be rendered, not to those who serve, but to Him who provides the repast. Since you are the ministers, it is shameless in you to claim for yourselves the entire ownership of the banquet,[6] though the most blessed Paul confesses with humility that he and the others are servants—in order that no one may imagine that he ought to place his hope in Apostles or Bishops alone. On this account says the Apostle:

'For what is Paul, or what Apollo? Surely the ministers of Him, in whom you have believed?'[7]

Accordingly, in all those who serve there is not ownership but service.[8] Now, therefore, my brother Parmenian, you see that of the three elements [in

[1] *in die retributionis.* [2] *nobiscum de mercede contendere.*
[3] *Maiestatis dominium.* Cf. iv. 9: 'in Deo perennis Maiestas exundat.'
[4] *pro humanitate exhibita.* [5] Matt. xxv, 34.
[6] *totum convivii dominium.* [7] 1 Cor. iii, 4, 5.
[8] *in universis servientibus non dominium sed ministerium.*

Baptism] which I have mentioned above,[1] the one which is threefold [2] comes first, is immovable, is supreme and unchangeable, but that the person of any individual minister remains only for a time.

VIII. Concerning the faith of him who receives Baptism.

It remains [3] now to say something of the merit of the believer, to whom belongs the faith, which the Son of God placed before both His Sanctity and Majesty. For you cannot be more holy than is Christ. When that woman, whose daughter was dead, came to Him, and besought that she should be restored to life, He promised nothing of His own Power,[4] but asked about the faith of another, so that if the woman believed, her daughter should be raised up, in view of her mother's faith [5]; but that if she believed not, the Power of the Son of God would be idle, with nothing to do.[6] The woman is questioned. She replies that she believed that what she had asked for could be accomplished. She is ordered to depart. She returns to her house, and finds the daughter alive whom she had left dead. She does not rush to kisses, she does not hasten to embraces, but returns to render thanks to the Saviour. And the Son of God, that He might show that He had stood by,[7] and that her faith alone had worked, said to her:

'O woman, depart in peace. Thy faith hath made thee whole.' [8]

[1] The reference is to v, 4: 'In hoc sacramento baptismatis celebrando tres esse species constat.'

[2] *ex tribus speciebus illam primo tripartitam esse*, sc. the Trinity.

[3] Having discussed the part played by the Trinity and the minister (*operarius*) in Baptism, something must be said of the remaining *species*, the Faith of the adult recipient.

[4] *de virtute sua.* [5] *pro matris credulitate.*

[6] *feriata cessaret.* [7] *se vacasse.*

[8] Luke viii, 48. St. Optatus was evidently quoting by heart,

What comes of your saying:

'It is of the giver, not of the receiver'[1]?

And what think you of the centurion's faith? He besought the Saviour to ward off death from his son, when he was ill. Christ then went to the dying boy. In such estimation did the centurion hold Him, that he acknowledged the unworthiness of his house, and begged that the Son of God would not enter it in person,[2] but that He should send His Power, by which death might be put to flight, and the lad be restored to life. It was not the valour of the centurion, nor his wisdom that was praised, but his faith:

'And his son was cured at that hour.'[3]

Of a truth it is 'of the giver,' not of him that receives![4] There are many things of this kind in the Gospel about perfect faith, but we must finish the story of at least three witnesses to Faith.[5]

and in consequence got strangely mixed. It is hardly necessary to point out that no such incident as that here described is to be found in any of the Gospels. Optatus seems to have been confusing his recollections of Luke viii, 42–48 with Matt. viii, 5 and Luke vii, 2 *seq.*

[1] *dantis est, non accipientis* was, as we have learned already, a saying of the Donatists. By 'the giver' they meant the Minister of the Sacrament, one of themselves, one of the holy. St. Optatus has already shown, in answer to their argument *Nemo dat quod non habet*, that the real giver is God. He now proves that God does not '*work*' (*vacat*), but is always ready to *give*, and lets the recipient receive according to his faith. Unless he who is to be baptised possesses faith, God will not give the grace of Baptism, even as our Lord on earth would not work miracles excepting on behalf of those who believed—their faith He put before His own power.

[2] *totus* = corporeally. [3] Matt. viii, 13.

[4] This is evidently sarcasm.

[5] *vel tria complenda sunt fidei testimonia.* Optatus often uses *vel* in the sense of *at least.*

What think you of that woman, who, after she had been ill for twelve years of a hidden malady, belonging to women, and had spent all her substance upon doctors,[1] on beholding so many wonderful works[2] performed by the Son of God, went into the crowd, saw the physician, saw also the people? Her pain[3] urged her on to ask for medicine, shame hindered her from disclosing, in the presence of men, the cause of her complaint. Her silent faith told her what to do.[4]

'I will send forth my hand,' [she said] 'and I will touch the hem of His garment and I shall be healed.'

When no one observed her, in the midst of the crowd she put forth her hand. She touched and was healed. But she did not venture to tell aloud that for which she had not ventured to ask. However, that the fruit of her faith might not be hidden from those who were unaware of it, the Saviour asked:

'Who has touched Me?'

His disciples marvelled and said:

'The crowds press on Thee, yet Thou dost ask, "Who has touched Me?"'

and Christ asked:

'Who, I say, has touched Me? I have felt that virtue has gone forth from Me.'

So the woman acknowledged that she it was who had touched Him and been healed. In the other cases the mother had asked for her daughter, the centurion

[1] Luke viii, 43–46; Matt. ix, 20–22; Mark v, 25–34.
[2] *tantas celebrari virtutes* (cf. iv, 9).
[3] *dolor.* [4] *invenit consilium tacita fides.*

had asked for his son. Here neither did the woman ask, nor did Christ promise, but faith obtained all that it anticipated.[1] Without doubt 'it is of him that gives, not of him that receives.'[2]

IX. That the example of Naaman the Syrian was brought by Parmenian without relevance.

In order to add to the bulk of your treatise, you have thought well, my brother Parmenian, to describe Naaman the Syrian at length as some kind of unripe mass of hardest wounds just coming to their birth.[3] What has this to do with our present business? You might bring it forward relevantly, and might well have employed a long discourse about it, had you

[1] *fides quantum praesumpsit exegit.* *Quantum*, 'so far as,' = 'all that.' Ziwsa, however, thinks that *exegit* here = *impetravit.*

[2] *dantis est, non accipientis.* It is clear that Parmenian had given a series of proofs, concluding at the end of each: *Dantis est, non accipientis*, and Optatus ironically repeats the words. According to the argument of St. Optatus there are three 'species': (α) The Name of the Trinity by which all the grace is given; (β) the minister of the Sacrament, who is only instrumental—a servant; and (γ) the faith of the recipient, which by the ministry of (β) impetrates the grace from (α). Finally therefore all depends upon (γ). The Trinity is unchangeable, the minister a mere servant, but the disposition of the recipient all-important. If, then, outside the Church the recipient has faith the Baptism will be valid. Of course this implies that although baptism *by* heretics (if administered in the Name of the Trinity) is valid, the baptism *of* a heretic is invalid. But we have to bear in mind that St. Optatus assumes (for such had so far for the most part been the experience of the Church) that a heretic does not believe in the Trinity or in the Catholic Doctrine of the Incarnation (cf. note 1, p. 17). His argument, so far as it is here stated (apart from any implications), is good, but incomplete. The doctrine of *character* handed down by the Greek Fathers was unknown to St. Optatus. He had no idea of *character* being given without grace, nor of *reviviscentia* on arriving at true and living Faith.

[3] *quasi immaturam quandam durissimorum nascentium vulnerum massam.*

come across some catechumen of rudest morals[1] and hardest heart, who should refuse to receive the most gentle grace of the saving Water.[2] With relevance in that case would your words have shown how man may be renewed[3]; with relevance might you then have pointed out that an inveterate[4] hardness of nature may be changed and softened into the flesh of an infant. But, with regard to this business, which we are at present discussing together, to what purpose have you recalled such a history as this[5]? For we do not read here[6] that anyone had washed that leprous Syrian before the word or at the command[7] of Elisha, in such a way that he might be duly washed again to his greater advantage.[8] But even if it were so, still, it would not serve your purpose,[9] as something which you might lawfully imitate. For we do not read that he had first washed in the waters of Syria, or that he had been washed by anyone, without gaining thereby any advantage. But if it had been so, this would not appertain to the praise of Elisha (who did not wash him, but gave him advice); rather would it redound to the glory of the Jordan that the first[10] grace came to the Syrian[11]—in that river wherein afterwards, in the time of John,

[1] *scabrosissimis moribus.*
[2] *qui lenissimam gratiam aquae salutaris accipere detractaret.*
[3] *hominis innovationem.*
[4] *veternosam.* Cf. 'vetus, vietus, veternosus senex': Ter. *Eun.* iv, 4, 21.
[5] *talis commemorata est lectio.* [6] Cf. 4 Reg. v.
[7] *iussione.* Casaubon reads with G *ante . . . iussionem.*
[8] *ut merito denuo melius lavaretur.*
[9] *nec sic vobis occurreret.*
[10] *primitivam.* [11] *illi homini.*

through confession unto repentance, the sins of a multitude [1] were to die.

X. The Parable of the Marriage Feast was wrongly brought forward by Parmenian.

Lastly what is to be said with regard to that part of your treatise concerning the heavenly nuptials, in which—taking away hope of future things—you have applied it all to the present time, saying that he, who escaped your doorkeepers and ministers,[2] has been cut off from your fellowship, in such a way as to be cast outside,[3] with contumely, far from the communion of the Faithful? If the parable mean this,[4] nothing is left for faith to hope, nothing for the resurrection to restore,[5] nothing further in heaven to be awaited, nothing [6] for God, the King [7] and Father of the Family, to recognise at His own Banquet, when He shall rejoice over the presence of many and grieve over the absence of some,[8] and shall say that many have been called, but few chosen.[9]

[1] *populorum peccata.* This use of *populi* = multitude is not uncommon in Optatus.

[2] *qui ianitores et ministros fefellerit vestros.*

[3] *foras.* [4] *si ita est.*

[5] *quod resurrectio repraesentet.*

[6] sc. the Wedding Garment.

[7] Casaubon supplies the word *caelestis* after *Rex*, but since the word *Deus* follows, *caelestis* (which is not in the MSS.) hardly seems necessary.

[8] *praesentia multorum gaudeat et de aliquorum absentia contristetur. aliquorum*, i.e. the Donatists. Optatus on several occasions already has spoken of God grieving (cf. i, 2 *bis*; ii, 24; ii, 26; iii, 2 'Deus dolet'). Here he represents Him as grieving over the absence of those first called, and rejoicing over the presence of others from the byways and hedges. St. Optatus evidently leaves the opposition between his *praesentia multorum* and the *pauci electi* without noticing it.

[9] Cf. Matt. xxii, 14.

In that case there will be no occasion for Him to be wrath with the man who is without the Wedding Garment.

For the Son of God, Christ Himself, is the Bridegroom ; He is also the Garment and the Tunic, that floats in the water, to clothe many,[1] yet awaits others innumerable[2] and is never used up.[3]

And before anyone say that I have been rash in calling the Son of God the Garment, let him read the words of the Apostle who says :

> 'As many of you as have been baptised in the Name of Christ, have put on Christ.'[4]

O tunic ever one and unchangeable, which fitly[5] clothes all ages and forms, which is not too loose[6] in infants, nor stretched in youth, nor changed in women !

Assuredly the day will come, when the heavenly nuptials begin to be celebrated. There without anxiety shall they sit down, who have preserved

[1] *cum Filius Dei Ipse Christus sit Sponsus et vestis et tunica natans in aqua, quae multos vestiat.* Casaubon has suggested *natos in aqua* for *natans in aqua.* If this suggestion be adopted, we translate 'and the Tunic, wherewith He may clothe many who are born in the water (the baptised).' This, however, has no MS. authority, and is quite unnecessary. The spiritual garment of grace is Christ, whom the baptised 'puts on' (*induit*), as the water flows over him. But St. Optatus will not identify Christ with the water—so He is the Grace in the water—a spiritual garment invisibly 'floating in the water,' which clothes the baptised, as the water covers him. It is a very beautiful idea. There seems to be no reference here to the *ἰχθύς.* (Still cf. iii, 2 : 'Hic est *piscis,* qui in baptismate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur.')

[2] *infinitos.*

[3] *nec vestiendo deficiat.*

[4] Gal. iii, 27.

[5] *decenter.*

[6] *nec rugatur.* Literally '*is not wrinkled.*'

the one Baptism.[1] For with regard to any who has allowed himself to be rebaptised by you—resurrection is not denied him, for he has believed in the resurrection of the Flesh.[2] He shall rise indeed, but naked. But because he has allowed you to spoil him of his wedding garment, he shall hear the Father of the Family speak thus:

'My friend,' that is to say—'I recognise thee—once thou didst renounce the devil, and wert converted to Me, and I gave thee a wedding garment. Why hast thou come thus, without that which I gave thee?'—that is to say, 'why hast thou not what I gave thee?'

For no one can be angry with one who has not something, which has not been given him.

'Thou didst receive a wedding garment, together with these others, and thou alone art without one. Why hast thou come naked and doleful[3]? Who has torn his spoils from thee? What thieves' doors hast thou entered[4]? What murderous robbers[5] hast thou met on the way?'

However many they are who come thus, they shall have no place at that banquet.[6]

[1] *qui baptisma singulare servaverint.*

[2] Is it the case that this strange sentence shows that St. Optatus was a *Chiliast*? It is quite possible that the text as we have it is corrupt; however, the view that St. Optatus held Millennarian tenets in some form or other is at least plausible. We know that, though St. Augustine abandoned Chiliasm, he would by no means have held that its repudiation, even in his time, was a matter of obligation.

[3] *nudus et lugubris.* [4] *quas fraudulentas adisti fauces?*

[5] *quos latrones?* (cf. i, 19).

[6] All the MSS. finish this Book at this point.

XI. As the Donatists could not rebaptise children who were dead, why should they rebaptise the living?

And to make an end, however late,[1] I think that even this is enough. Still, although we may be making a mistake in bringing forward so many proofs, let me give this one more. Let us suppose that, in your absence, a thousand have been baptised. Of these say that a hundred have chanced to die. For a little while keep your hands off this wickedness.[2] Let your 'holiness' (as you call it) first raise again those who have been buried, let it cleanse the dead if it can, and let them be brought back to the living.[3] If you are not able to raise the dead, to what purpose do you endeavour to lay hands upon the living, excepting to fulfil that which God spoke of you through the Prophet Ezekiel,[4] saying:

'that they might kill souls, which ought not to die'?

[1] This chapter is to be found in G at the end of Chapter viii. Though not to be found in RBv, Du Pin thinks on intrinsic grounds that it was written by Optatus, but that it has been dislocated in position. He placed it (and in this Ziwsa follows him) here, at the end of the Book. The words with which the passage begins (*Et ut vel sero compendium faciam, credo etiam hoc sufficere* etc.) undoubtedly seem to point to this transposition. It is possible that St. Optatus placed it in his first edition and deliberately omitted it in his second. It is certainly very poor and not worthy of the book or of its argument.

[2] sc. of rebaptising.

[3] If the holiness of the Donatists was great enough, as they claimed, to give the grace of Baptism—the life of the soul, it ought to suffice to restore the life of the body. According to Catholic doctrine God gives the life of the soul in Baptism, but God can also, if it so please Him, raise the dead to renewed earthly life.

[4] Ez. xiii, 19.

# BOOK THE SIXTH

IN THIS BOOK IT IS SHOWN THAT THE DONATIST BISHOPS WICKEDLY DESTROYED ALTARS, THAT THEY SOLD THE HOLY VESSELS, AND WITHOUT WARRANT STRIPPED NUNS OF THEIR VEILS.

I. The wickedness of the Donatists in breaking or scraping the altars.

YOUR wicked actions with regard to the Divine Sacraments[1] have—so it seems to me—been clearly shown up. I now have to describe things done by you, as you yourselves will not be able to deny, with cruelty and folly. For what so sacrilegious as to break, to scrape, to take away altars of God, upon which you too once offered sacrifice,[2] upon which were laid both the prayers of the people, and the Members of Christ,[3] where Almighty God was called upon, where the Holy Spirit descended in answer to prayer, from which many have received the pledge of everlasting salvation, and the safeguard of faith, and the hope of resurrection? Altars, I say, upon which the Saviour forbade the gifts of the brotherhood[4] to be laid, unless they should be seasoned with peace.[5]

[1] *in divinis Sacramentis quid nefarie feceritis.*
[2] *in quibus et vos obtulistis.*
[3] *in quibus et vota populi et Membra Christi portata sunt.*
[4] *fraternitatis munera.* [5] *de pace condita.*

'Lay down,' He said, 'thy gift before the altar,[1] and go back, agree with thy brother, that the priest may be able to offer on thy behalf.'[2]

For what is an altar excepting the seat of both the Body and the Blood of Christ?[3]

All these altars you, in your madness, have either scraped, or broken, or taken away. Whatever reason you may have had prompting you to this wickedness (for which no atonement is possible), it should have been done in the same way [everywhere]. But in one place, the abundance of wood it was (as I think) that led to the altars being broken up, in other places the lack of timber caused them to be scraped, whilst yet again elsewhere it was partly the sense of shame, which induced men to take them away. But in each case a disgraceful wickedness was committed when you laid sacrilegious and impious hands upon so great a Thing.[4]

Why should I mention the hired mob of abandoned wretches, and the wine that was given as the pay of crime?[5]—the wine, for which a fire was made out of

[1] Matt. v, 24.

[2] This is the most extraordinary instance of St. Optatus' habit of quoting the Scriptures from memory. That he should, however, have added the words '*ut possit pro te sacerdos offerre*' and applied them to the Christian priest and sacrifice shows how unquestioned at the time was the Catholic doctrine on the Mystery of the altar. Had it been otherwise, he would necessarily have been more careful. No one can imagine that such carelessness would be possible at any period when the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was questioned amongst Christians.

[3] *Quid est enim altare nisi sedes et Corporis et Sanguinis Christi?*

[4] *tantae rei*, sc. the altar of God.

[5] *quid perditorum conductam referam multitudinem et vinum in mercedem sceleris datum?*

the broken remnants of the altars, that unclean lips might drink it [hot] with sacrilegious draughts?[1] If in your jaundiced judgement we seemed to you to be corrupt,[2] what harm had God done you, God, who at those altars[3] was once habitually invoked? In what way had Christ offended you, whose Body and Blood were wont during determinate times there to dwell[4]? In what way had you yourselves even offended yourselves, that you should break down those altars, upon which before us you had (as you think, with sanctity) offered sacrifice for long periods of time? In impiously attacking our hands there, where the Body of Christ used to dwell,[5] you have also smitten your own.[6]

By thus acting you have imitated the Jews. They laid hands upon Christ on the cross; you have struck Him upon the altar.[7] If you wished to attack Catholics at these altars, there[8] you might have spared at least your own former sacrifices.[9]

Thy[10] pride has now been manifested in that place

[1] *quod ut immundo ore sacrilegis haustibus biberetur, calida de fragmentis altarium facta est.*

[2] *sordidi.* [3] *illic.*

[4] *cuius illic per certa momenta Corpus et Sanguis habitabat.*

[5] *dum impie persequimini manus nostras, illic, ubi Corpus Christi habitabat.*

[6] *feristis et vestras.* The Donatist excuse for sacrilegiously destroying the altars was that Mass had been celebrated there by the hands of Catholics (Betrayers, as they called them); but Mass had been celebrated at those same altars by their own hands as well.

[7] *hoc modo Iudaeos estis imitati; illi iniecerunt Christo manus in cruce, a vobis percussus est in altari.*

[8] *illic.* [9] *vel vestris antiquis oblationibus.*

[10] St. Optatus now, using the singular number, addresses Parmenian personally.

where formerly thou didst offer sacrifice with humility, there thou dost freely sin, where once thou wert accustomed to pray on behalf of the sins of many. After this fashion you[1] have, of your own accord, entered into the company of sacrilegious priests, and are associated with the crimes of wicked men, concerning whom Elijah the prophet makes his plaint before the Lord. For he has used these words (with which you too, amongst others, have deserved to be accused by him):

'O Lord,' he says, 'they have broken down Thine altars.'[2]

When he says 'Thine,' he shows that the [altar] where any offering has been made to God by anyone whomsoever, belongs to God.[3]

It might have satisfied your madness, to have wounded the members of the Church, and to have divided by your beguilements the peoples of God, who were formerly placed in unity. Amongst all your other proceedings, you might at least have spared the altars. Why did you break, together with the altars themselves, the entreaties and longings of men?[4] For from them the people's prayer was wont to go up to the ears of God. Why did you cut to pieces the road of their prayers to Him?[5] With impious hands you have laboured in a sort of

[1] St. Optatus here suddenly reverts from the singular to the plural number—apparently from Parmenian in particular to the Donatists in general.

[2] 3 Kings xix, 10.

[3] *res est Dei.*

[4] *cur vota et desideria hominum cum ipsis altaribus confregistis?*

[5] *cur concidistis precibus viam?*

fashion to draw away the ladder,[1] that you might prevent supplication ascending in the accustomed way to God.

And though all of you shared in one conspiracy, still, in this matter, whilst your wrongdoing was the same, you carried it out by different methods.

If it was sufficient to move, it was not lawful to break; if it was right to break, it is a sin to have scraped. For if, as your assembly decreed, it was not lawful [to preserve the altars], that man who broke them up would seem to have acted rightly. In that case he is guilty who, by scraping, preserved the larger part of them.

What is this new and foolish wisdom of yours to seek for that which is new in the very heart of that which is old[2]? It is as though, after having removed some skin from the body, you were to look, as it were, for a second skin in that part of the body which lay hid under the part which you had cut away.[3] The gift[4] which is proper to itself and, by reason of

[1] In this chapter St. Optatus calls the altar successively: 'That which carries the prayers of the people and the members of Christ,' 'the place of the gifts of the brotherhood,' 'the seat of both the Body and Blood of Christ,' 'the dwelling-place during fixed periods of the Body and Blood of Christ,' 'the dwelling place of the Body of Christ,' 'the possession of God,' 'the place whence the prayer of the people was wont to go up to the ears of God,' 'the Way,' and 'the Ladder' to God.

[2] *novitatem quaerere in visceribus vetustatis.* It has been suggested to read *maiestatis* instead of *vetustatis*. But this supposed emendation takes away the contrast with *novitatem* and the whole point of the analogy, which is sufficiently explained by that which follows immediately.

[3] *in latenti corpore cutem quasi alteram quaerere.*

[4] *donum*, sc. consecrationis.

its unity,[1] is a whole in itself, may, after something has been taken from it, be lessened. Changed it cannot be. You have, it is true, scraped what seemed good to you, but what you hate is still there! Again, even though you have agreed,[2] that whatever has been touched by us in the Name of God in His actual service,[3] should be deemed by you to be unclean, which of the Faithful is there who is unaware that during the celebration of the Mysteries, the wood of the altar is itself covered with linen[4]? During the sacred rites themselves,[5] the covering can be touched, not the wood. Or, if the veils can be penetrated by the touch, then so can the wood; and, if the wood can be penetrated, then so can the earth. If you scrape the wood, you should also dig up the earth which is underneath, you should make a deep hole, whilst you are searching after that which you are pleased to judge to be purity.[6] But take care lest you go down to those below,[7] there to find Korah, Dathan and Abiram, the schismatics—your masters.

It is, then, well known that you have both broken and scraped altars. How is it that in this matter your madness seems to have presently somewhat cooled down[8]? For we see that afterwards you changed your plan, and that the altars were now no longer either broken or scraped by you, but only

[1] *quod unum est.* The gift of consecration is bestowed upon the altar as a whole, and in it all its parts. It possesses a unity which may be likened to that of the Church.

[2] *quodsi sic coniurastis.* [3] *in ipso ministerio.*

[4] *linteamine.* [5] *inter ipsa sacramenta.*

[6] *dum pro vestro arbitrio quaeritis puritatem.* [7] *ad inferos.*

[8] *quasi languere.*

moved. If this was enough, then you yourselves prove that what you did at first should by no means have been done.

II. That the Donatists sacrilegiously broke and sold the chalices.

But when you broke the very Chalices, which carry the Blood of Christ,[1] you committed two horrible sins.[2] For you have melted them down, thus making money for yourselves by abominable bargains.[3] Nor in this business did you even trouble to select the purchasers, but were guilty of sacrilege in selling indiscriminately,[4] and of avarice in selling at all. You also suffered[5] your own hands to be burned, with which you were accustomed, before us, to handle these same Chalices.[6] Still you ordered the sale to take place everywhere. Perhaps wanton women

[1] *Christi Sanguinis portatores* (RB *portitores*).

[2] *hoc tamen inmane facinus a vobis geminatum est.*

[3] *quorum species revocastis in massas, merces nefariis nundinis procurantes.*

[4] *inconsiderate* = passim.

[5] *passi estis.* Casaubon conjectures *passi essetis* = in your avarice you would even have suffered.

[6] This is simply a sarcastic retort. Albaspinaeus and Du Pin find here a mysterious identification between the chalices and the hands of the priests who used them. When the chalices were melted down, so metaphorically were the hands of the priests who had touched them. In so far as this was true, it held good not of Catholics only, but also of Donatists who had said Mass at the same altars with the same chalices. It seems however to me that the thought of St. Optatus may be expressed more simply. If the Donatists imagined that by burning the chalices which they considered to have been polluted through the touch of Catholic priests, they were burning away that touch—in the concrete, those hands—they should remember that at the same time they were burning away their own touch—their own hands—for they too had touched the chalices which they burned. The drift of the argument is sufficiently clear, but to us it must seem laboured and far-fetched (cf. note 4, p. 255).

bought them for their own purposes; Pagans bought them, so that from them they might manufacture vessels, in which to burn incense to their idols. O shameful wickedness! O unheard-of crime! To take away something from God, that you might give it to idols—to steal something from Christ, that it might serve for a sacrilege.

III. Refutation of the Donatist pretext that the altars and sacred vessels had been contaminated through being used by Catholics.

But I perceive that, in this matter, in order to stir up undeserved hatred against us, you wish to have recourse to the book of the Prophet Haggai, where it has been written:

'Those things which have been touched by the defiled have been defiled.'[1]

For those who are in anger, it is easy whilst the anger lasts to hurl abuse, but whenever an accusation is made, some clear proof is necessary.

Who then amongst us has ever entered the temples of idols? Who has watched the sacrilegious sacrifices? Men may be defiled by incense,[2] odours,[3] sacrileges, sacrifices, blood.[4] But in this matter between us, who has entered the temple? Who has burnt incense to idols? Who has been stained by unclean odours[5]? Who has looked upon the blood of an unclean beast, or of a man, poured forth? Whom can you prove to have given his advice for the perpetration of any

[1] Hagg. ii, 14.

[2] *fumis.*

[3] *nidoribus* (cf. infra 'immundis nidoribus' and iii, 8: 'immundis arae fumabant nidoribus').

[4] *fumis, nidoribus, sacrilegiis, sacrificiis, sanguine.* Casaubon thinks that Optatus wrote *fumi sacrilegis nidoribus, sacrilego sacrificii sanguine.*

[5] *immundis nidoribus.*

evil deed? Prove—if you can—that even one Bishop has been mixed up with any wrongdoing. You have your suspicions, about some Primate or other, who was at that time reported to have faltered.[1] Suspicion is not a sufficient ground for accusation.[2] Who has charged him? Who has convicted him? On what occasion was he ever ashamed, or put out of countenance?[3] Keep your suspicions to yourselves.[4]

So, as we have said above, if in this matter anything was done with severity,[5] we have shown, when it is looked at in its commencement, that your fathers are responsible. Why then do you speak of Catholics, as though they were defiled? Is it because we have followed the Will and Command of God by loving peace, by communicating with the whole world, in union with those who live in the East, where Christ was born, where His holy footsteps touched the ground, where His adorable Feet have walked, where so many and such great miracles were worked by the Son of God Himself, where so many Apostles accompanied Him, where is the Sevenfold Church,[6] on having been cut off from which, you do not merely fail to grieve, but in a sort of way rejoice? You call us defiled, because we have loved Unity well-pleasing to God. Because we have agreed with and hold communion with the Corinthians, Galatians,

[1] *ambulare* (= *ire* opposite of *stare*).
[2] *suspicio non est idoneum crimen.*
[3] *ubi vel erubuit vel confusus est?*
[4] *servate vobis suspiciones vestras.* [5] *id est*, by Macarius.
[6] *Septiformis Ecclesia.* The Seven Churches of Asia which (mystically) were interpreted as the whole. (Cf. note 2, p. 79.)

Thessalonians, you call us defiled. You call us defiled, because we have not, together with you, read corrupt [1] books—deny, if you can, that you read books which differ [from those of the Church].[2] How do you venture to read the Epistles written to the Corinthians, you who have refused to communicate with the Corinthians? To what purpose do you read aloud that which was written to Galatians or to Thessalonians, with whom you are not in communion? [3]

Since it is certain that all these things are so, understand that *you* have been cut off from the holy Church, and that *we* are not defiled. What ground, therefore, have you for thinking that the prophet Haggai can be of any help to you?

The altars, then, and the sacred vessels, which we have mentioned above, were formerly in both your hands and ours. If you slander our hands, why at those altars [4] condemn your own hands as well?

But you say that you have read:

'That, which one, who is defiled, has touched, is defiled.' [5]

Suppose that anyone has been defiled, so that

[1] *furtivas lectiones* = falsified versions of Holy Scripture.

[2] *alienas lectiones*. If the Donatists denied that they used corrupt versions, at least (writes St. Optatus) they will not be able to deny that they use *alienas lectiones*. Ziwsa writes that *alienas* here = *diversas*, and so I have translated it. But may it not mean *books to which, as schismatics, you have no right*? (Cf. ii, 6: *Extra septem Ecclesias quicquid foris est, alienum est.*)

[3] St. Augustine (*Ep.* clxv) also uses this argument: 'Quid autem perversius et insanius quam lectoribus easdem epistulas legentibus dicere, Pax tecum, et ab earum Ecclesiarum Pace separari, quibus ipsae epistulae scriptae sunt?'

[4] *si infamatis manus nostras, quare illic damnatis et vestras?* Cf. note 6, p. 252.

[5] Hagg. ii, 14.

the things which he has touched appear to be defiled—let it be granted, if there has only been the touch, that the things which the defiled has touched, without any invocation of the Name of God, may be contaminated—provided that silence has been kept about God. For if there be invocation of the Name of God, the invocation itself sanctifies even that which appeared to have been defiled. Thus when two hundred and fifty censers, which had been carried in the hands of sinners, remained cast away (after those sinners were swallowed up by the earth), as the Holy priest Aaron hesitated what to do about them, he heard the Voice of God, saying :

> 'Take up, O Aaron, these censers, and make plates of them and fasten them in the corners of the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, because, though those who carried them have sinned, nevertheless these vessels are holy, for My Name has been invoked with them, saith God.' [1]

And surely to carry is more than to touch. Therefore it is quite clear that a thing can be made holy by the invocation of the Name of God, even though it be a sinner who invokes God. For the touch cannot have as much efficacy, as has the invocation of God's Name. And do you too, who count on your own sanctity, tell us whether the touch makes holy or the invocation. Surely it is the invocation not the touch. Otherwise if you rely upon the touch alone, touch a board, a stone, a garment—and let us see whether (if silence be kept about God) they can be sanctified.

[1] Cf. Num. xvi, 37, 38.

IV. That virgins consecrated to God were wrongfully stripped by the Donatists of the ornaments proper to their state.

Now consider what a foolish—what an empty thing it is for you to have exercised your will and your sham authority[1] by making God's virgins[2] learn to do Penance, so that they who had already made their Profession had afterwards by your orders to change the signs of their choice upon their heads,[3] and were compelled to cast away their veils, and to receive others in their place.[4] First tell us where there is any commandment that has been given concerning veils. For virginity is a matter of choice,[5] not of necessity.

So Paul the Apostle, that famous innkeeper,[6] to whose care was entrusted a people wounded with the wounds of their sins, had received two pence to lay out—that is, the two Testaments. These he, as it were, expended by his teaching, and taught how Christian husbands and wives ought to live; but, when he was asked what command he would give concerning virgins, he answered that nothing about

[1] *quasi dignitatem vestram.*

[2] Nuns who had deserted the Catholic Church for the Donatist schism.

[3] *ut iamdudum professae signa voluntatis capitibus . . . immutarent.* Casaubon thinks that there should be a comma after *professae*, and conjectures that the word *imposita* has fallen out after *capitibus.* He remarks that the words *profiteri* and *professae* were already quite common, but that he knows no other instance of the phrase *capite profiteri signa voluntatis*, whereas Optatus proceeds very soon to write of veils *capiti impositae.* But *signa voluntatis* for *veils* sounds quite Optatian. The word *signum* for a Nun's veil is traditional in the Church. Thus the consecrated virgin on receiving the veil is bidden by the Pontifical straightway to stand up and to sing 'Posuit *signum* in faciem meam.'

[4] *ut mitellas alias proicerent et alias accepissent.* For the first *alias* RBv read *aureas.*

[5] *voluntatis.*

[6] *stabularius ille.*

virginity had been commanded. He acknowledged that he had laid out the two Testaments, that is the two pence. In a certain way the commission was exhausted, but, inasmuch as Christ, who had entrusted the wounded man to his keeping, had promised that He would repay whatsoever over and above might be expended upon his care,[1] Paul, after having laid out the two pence, gives not commandments, but a counsel with regard to virginity. He does not stand in the way of those who desire it,[2] but neither does he drive or force those who desire it not.[3]

'He who has given his virgin, does well, and he who has not given her, does better.'[4]

These are words of counsel, nor are any precepts joined to them, neither as to the kind of wool from which the veil should be made, nor with what sort of purple dye it should be stained. For virginity cannot be aided with this kind of garment,[5] nor with it are quenched the heats of the soul,[6] which sometimes are enkindled by the summer,[7] nor by it is the mind

[1] *quicquid in curam amplius erogasset.* As St. Optatus understands by the two pence of the parable the two Testaments, i.e. the Commandments of God, so by 'whatever thou shalt spend over and above' (Luke x, 35) he understands works of supererogation, v.g. the Counsels of Perfection.

[2] *nec impedimento est volentibus.*

[3] This passage, from 'For virginity is a matter of choice' to 'who desire it not,' is incorporated, as it stands, by St. Fulgentius. (Cf. ii, *ad Monimum*, cap. 13.)

[4] Cf. 1 Cor. vii, 25–38.

[5] *hoc panno.*

[6] *aestus animi.*

[7] *aestas*, so Rv. G has *aetas*. This is adopted by Ziwsa, but is it not possible that Optatus used *aestas* metaphorically in juxtaposition with *aestus* (summer heats) just before, according to his custom of playing upon words?

relieved, which from time to time is pressed down by the burdens of desires. For if it were otherwise, not one veil, but very many, would be placed on the virgin's head, that, whensoever the desires of the flesh should trouble[1] the soul, the number of veils might fight against the stings of the mind.[2] The veil was thought of as a sign for the head, not as a remedy on behalf of chastity. So a garment of this kind may get old, and be gnawed through and worn out; and yet virginity, as long as it has suffered no damage, can be safe without a veil.

This kind of life[3] is a kind of spiritual marriage. They had already come to the nuptials of their Spouse by their choice and Profession; and had already loosed their hair,[4] thus to show that they had given up worldly nuptials, and were joined to their spiritual Spouse. They had already celebrated heavenly nuptials. For what reason have you forced them to loose their hair a second time? For what reason is it, I say, that you have exacted of them a second Profession? Who is the second spiritual spouse whom they may wed a second time? When did He die, to whom they had been wedded, that they may marry again? You have laid heads once more bare, which had already received the veil. You have stripped them of the marks[5] of their Profession, which seem to have been introduced as a protection

[1] *pungerent.* [2] *impugnationem mentis.*

[3] *hoc genus*, sc. voluntary profession of virginity.

[4] Nuns, like married women, of old 'put up' their hair. It was not, as now, cut off.

[5] *indicia.*

against abductors or suitors.[1] The veil is a sign of their free choice — not an aid to chastity[2]—lest the suitor should either continue to sue for, or the abductor dare to violate, that which had already been consecrated to God.

The veil, accordingly, is a sign, not a sacrament. You have then found virgins of this kind, who had already been wedded spiritually—these you forced to second nuptials, and ordered once more to loose their hair.

This is not suffered even by those women who enter upon a natural marriage.[3] For if it should have chanced to any one of them to change her husband,[4] after widowhood has befallen her, the great secular festivity is not repeated; she is not puffed up to the skies; there is no great assemblage of people provided. Therefore, you have not taken away ornaments from their heads, but (as we have said above) the proofs of the choice of the better part. You have sprinkled the hair, which had been already consecrated to God, with unclean ashes.[5] You even gave orders that they should be washed with salt water.

And would that you had quickly restored that which you had taken away. You lengthened out delays, so that some who were dragged back to [the world] remained a long time in their original dress, after you had removed the outward signs, with which they had fortified themselves against suitors and

[1] *raptores aut petitores.* [2] *non castitatis auxilium.*
[3] *quae carnaliter nubunt.* [4] *maritum mutare.*
[5] sc. the ashes of Penance, inflicted by the Donatists.

abductors. For when men saw that you had removed the barrier which formerly stood in their way, instead of suitors they became abductors. Nor did anyone seem to himself to have sinned, in carrying off one who was such as he had seen her to be, at the time when he was looking for a wife.[1]

V. That the sacred books and vessels were taken away forcibly from the Catholics by the Donatists.

In this business how great were the injuries that you did to God, how great were the gains that you won for the Devil. You impiously melted down Chalices, you savagely[2] broke and foolishly[3] scraped altars, you forced wretched maidens (not without disgrace) to take a second veil, although nothing can be read in Scripture[4] about the first. And I cannot pass over a thing, which neither is pleasing to God, nor can be excused by your adherents, nor be defended by any man. You judged that by civil courts[5] and public laws the books of the Divine Law should, through the action of officials,[6] be torn away from very many, wishing to have for themselves alone that which before the schism the Church had held for all in common.[7] I do not fear, as a Christian, to state a fact of which, through your accusations, the pagan officers could not be unaware.[8] You seized with

[1] *dum talem rapuit, qualem viderat, quando, ut uxorem acciperet, postulabat.*

[2] *crudeliter.* [3] *inconsulte.* [4] *in lectione.*

[5] *per iudicia saecularia.* Under Julian the Apostate the churches and sacred books were taken from the Catholics and given to the Donatists by imperial decree and process of law.

[6] *executione officiorum.* '*Officia* pro *officialibus*, ut *ministeria* pro *ministris* et sexcenta huius generis' (Casaubon).

[7] *quod Pax in commune possederat.*

[8] *quod vobis postulantibus gentilis executio non potuit ignorare.* Ziwsa points out that *postulare* here = *criminari* (cf. iii, 3: '*postulabant* utique contra episcopos').

violence the altar cloths and books belonging to the Lord,[1] which formerly had been possessed in common. You also seized the palls [2] and the manuscripts. In your proud judgement you thought that in each case they had been defiled. If I mistake not, you made haste to purify all these things. Without doubt you washed the palls. Tell us what you did with the manuscripts. If you are to act wisely you must pass the same judgement in all things. Either wash both, or leave both alone. If you act differently, you will have tainted your own efforts.[3] The pall you wash; the manuscript you wash not. If you do well on one side, you do evil on the other. You are unable to deny that you give scandal on the one hand, if you do well on the other; and if you rejoice to seem full of respect for religion [4] in one matter, you ought also to bewail that you are held to be guilty of sacrilege in the other.

VI. The folly of the Donatists in washing the walls.

Now, what kind of thing have you done when you determined in many places to have even the walls washed,[5] and ordered the whole interior [6] to be sprinkled with salt water? [7]

[1] *velamina et instrumenta dominica extortistis.* For *velamina* Cochlaeus suggested *volumina*— a suggestion adopted by Casaubon.

[2] *pallas.* Casaubon thinks that *pallas* has crept in for *pallia* and quotes Victor Uticensis, who has written of *velaminum pallia* and of *pallia altaris.* But Pope Innocent I (*De Mysteriis Missae*, ii, 55) writes: 'Duplex est *palla* quae dicitur corporalis; una quam Diaconus super altare totum extendit, altera, quam super calicem plicatam imponit.'

[3] *corrupisti diligentiam tuam.* RB *concupisti.* [4] *religiosus.*

[5] sc. of churches that had been used by Catholics.

[6] *inclusa spatia aqua salsa spargi praecepistis.* For *inclusa* RBv read *in caussa*, Cochlaeus conjectured *sine caussa.*

[7] St. Optatus could not have written in the strain of the next paragraph, had he known anything of the later usage of mixing

O Water, which by God wert created sweet, over which the Holy Spirit was borne before the very birth of the world![1] O Water, which, that thou mightest make the land pure, hast washed the earth! O Water, which, in the days of Moses, after thou hadst been sweetened by wood,[2] so that thou mightest lose the bitterness that is natural to thee, didst satiate by thy most sweet draughts the hearts of so many people[3]! It has remained for thee, after so high an office, to receive no slight degradation![4] In the presence of Moses bitterness dies in thee, and to-day thy sweetness, together with the Catholic people, is harassed by schismatics.[5] Together we suffer the conflict, together we look for the vengeance of God.[6]

Tell us, my brother Parmenian, what injury the place had done you, what injury the very walls that they should suffer such things as these at your hands? Is it because within them God was entreated? Or, that there Christ was praised? Or, that there was invoked the Holy Ghost? Or, that there, though you were absent, the books of the Prophets and the Holy Gospels were read aloud? Or, that there the minds of brethren, who had once been at strife, had been brought into harmony? Or, that unity, well pleasing to God, had found there a house, wherein to dwell?

salt with water, to make Holy Water; much less had he known of the salt, water, ashes and wine prescribed, for certain purifications, in the Pontifical.

[1] Cf. Gen. i, 2.

[2] *indulcata ligno. Indulcare* = γλυκαίνειν. Cf. Martius 'Prudenter edulcare convenit vitam.'

[3] *tot populorum pectora suavissimis haustibus satiasti.* (Cf. Ex. xv, 23, 25.)

[4] *restabat tibi post promotionem non leviter degradari.*

[5] *a scismaticis hodie cum Catholicorum turba dulcedo tua vexatur.*

[6] *pares patimur bellum, pares expectamus vindicem Deum.*

Point out to us what it is that you have found to wash. If it be the footsteps of Catholics—we have trodden both street and square[1]—why do you not cleanse them all?[2] For you and we, in order to care for our bodies, have cleansed them in the same baths, and many of ours have often used them before you. If you think that everything should be purified after us—wash the water also, if you can. Or, if, as we have just said, our footsteps seem to you to be defiled, it might be enough to wash the earth. Why, then, have you thought fit to wash the walls also, on which the footsteps of men cannot be placed? We could not tread the walls, but have only been able to see them. But if you think that what has been touched even by our looks should be washed, why have you left other things unwashed? We see the roof; we also see the heavens. They cannot be washed by you! Have you deserved well of God by washing the one? In that case you would seem to have committed a sin, for which there is no expiation, in not washing the other. As, then, you wish to appear full of a sort of diligence in one quarter, you have been found to have been negligent in another. Your diligence, however, should be termed folly, or—to call it by its true name—vanity—unless, indeed, in thus acting you have perhaps inspired the uneducated populace with terror, making them think that, since the pillar in the church has been washed, so also should be their bodies.[3] If you have had this cunning design,

[1] *et in vico et in platea*, CG *plateis*.

[2] *quare non omnia emendatis?* (*emendare* = *rebaptisare*: i, 5 'post vos non *emendamus*'; v, 11 'Sanctitas vestra *emendet*, si potest, mortuos.' Cf. iii, 10: '*emendate* voluntatem Dei, si potestis.')

[3] sc. by Rebaptism.

you have craftily deceived the wretched people; if you have acted as you have done without thought, then your dulness[1] has been exposed. Those whom you have led astray know that your conduct in these matters has been stupid,[2] and this you will not yourselves be able to deny.

VII. That the Donatists raged even against the dead.

Why should I also mention that great act of irreverence which arose from your conspiracy to seize the temples for this purpose,[3] that you might claim the cemeteries for yourselves alone, and not permit the bodies of Catholics to be buried? To terrify the living, you do wrong even to the dead and refuse them a place for their funeral rites. If you had been at war with them whilst they were living, at least the death of your foe might appease your hatreds. Now that man is silent, with whom a moment ago you were in conflict, why insult his obsequies? Why interfere with his burial? To what purpose do you enter into strife with the dead? You have lost the fruit of your malice.[4] And if you are not willing that bodies should rest together,[5] you will not be able to separate their souls, set together[6] before God.

VIII. The Donatists compared to bird-catchers.

To make an end—it is impossible fully to narrate

[1] *vestra hebetudo.* [2] *haec vos stulte fecisse.*

[3] Even in places where the Donatists had a church of their own, they were empowered by the Edict of Julian to seize the church of the Catholics. St. Optatus here suggests that they did this in order to deprive Catholics of the privilege of burial amongst their fellow Catholics in the cemeteries which were attached to every Catholic church.

[4] *perdidisti malitiae fructum.*

[5] *in unum.* [6] *in uno.*

all the evil things that you have done; but we may take them for granted in you, who are the leaders of this wrongdoing. Still who could keep silence about those who are now yours—those, that is, whom you have succeeded in drawing to your faction either by party-spirit or by subtle craft [1]—not only men, but also women? From sheep they have been suddenly made wolves, from being faithful they have become faithless, from being patient full of rage, from lovers of peace lovers of strife, from lovers of simplicity full of craft, from lovers of modesty without shame, once gentle now they are savage, once innocent now they are doers of evil.

After persons of either sex have fallen away to you,[2] they grieve that others are still there, where they were born [3]; they urge those who are standing firm [4] to follow them in their fall. If they knew that they had gained glory,[5] they would have enjoyed their own happiness in silence.[6] But, desiring to have some consolation for their own wicked departure, they invite others to fall in like manner,[7] and accuse those who are resting [8] in the bosom of Mother Church as

[1] *quos aut factione aut subtilitate, ut vestros faceretis, seducere potuistis.*

[2] *post quod ad vos delapsi sunt aut delapsae.*

[3] sc. in the Catholic Church.

[4] *bene stantes*, sc. in Ecclesia Catholica. Cf. iii, 9: 'Aut stetit frater, sorore migrante.'

[5] *si scirent se gloriam consecutos.* Cf. v, 7: 'Quod quasi ad gloriam vestram a vobis semper auditur.'

[6] Nothing, of course, could have been easier to the Donatists than to retort this observation.

[7] *nunc autem perditos transitus suos consolari cupientes ceteros, ut similiter labantur, invitant. Consolari* = to divert their attention from their own mistake and thus get some consolation. Du Pin places a comma after *perditos*, thus making it agree with the *ceteros* that follows.

[8] *residentes.*

though they were slothful and slow.[1] For they are not ashamed to use these words :

'Gaius, Seius, or Gaia, Seia,[2] how long are you staying where you are ?'

That is to say :

'You ought now to follow me in my error, you ought now to desert the truth. How long are you staying where you are ?'

That is to say :

'Imitate me in my fall, imitate me in my shameful passing over.[3] How long will you be called one of the Faithful ? Now desert the Faith. Now learn to do Penance.'

You are bird-catchers, and these men or women are the birds. For there is not only one kind of bird-catchers.

Some there are who with an art that is not artful[4] go to trees resting on deep roots, which are to be found in front of a grove, where the birds fly naturally and sit on real boughs. Amongst them you will find no frauds, no wily devices. These men rely only upon their art and skill in bird-catching.

But I say that you resemble the bird-catcher, who, unlike the rest, is not content to go, after night has departed, before sunrise, to real trees. He carries his tree with him, and makes up into a bundle what will be his grove. Out of which, with all kinds of devices, he fashions a tree that has neither pith nor

[1] *quasi pigros.* In iii, 8 St. Optatus has called the schismatic Donatists *pigri.*

[2] *Gai Sei vel Gaia Seia* (cf. iii, 11).

[3] *transitus turpes.* Evidently it was inconceivable to St. Optatus that any deserters from the Catholic Church should invite others to join their schism from any sense of duty. [4] *arte simplici.*

roots. On this he places false boughs. So that, which had been lately cut down, now receives strange leaves in place of those which it had lost. Some birds he carries with him shut up in a cage. Upon the false branches he places others that have been stuffed to look as though they were alive. The living birds are hid in their cages, the others are seen, like living birds upon the branches. A double fraud is united by the craft of one man.[1] And to deceive the simplicity of the birds that are alive and flying about, those which are certainly dead seem to stretch out their necks and sing, whilst those which are out of sight in their prison are thought to be singing from the throats of the others. Between the appearance on the trees and the sound from the cage one crafty mind does its work. The birds that were already captured capture those that are free, and the birds that are dead slay those that are alive.[2]

Such are they whom you have wounded either by re-baptising them, or by making them submit to Penance. These men and women strive with great zeal and labour, that other men and women may perish with them—for fear lest they should perish alone.

[1] *iungitur una geminata fraude calliditas.*

[2] A friend has been kind enough to give me the following information:—In the Shahabad District of Bengal, there are bird-catchers to this day who place a light woodwork frame on their heads covered with small branches and leaves. Armed with a long thin pole with a small two-pronged fork at the end, which is bird-limed, they catch birds sitting on the trees high above them. The man under the cover cannot be seen by the birds, whilst he can see the birds through two small eye-holes in the cover.

## INTRODUCTION TO BOOK VII

At first sight there appears to be some question as to the genuineness of this Seventh Book. But on examination it becomes practically certain that the great bulk of the Book was written by St. Optatus several years after he had closed his original work with the striking metaphor on bird-catching to be found at the end of Book VI. Some slight doubt still remains concerning two passages in the first chapter, and one paragraph in the second chapter. But these are almost certainly (were it not for the opinion of Ziwsa, to which we shall shortly allude, we should write quite certainly) spurious. Accordingly—in this following the example of Du Pin—we have separated them from the text, and marked them A, B, C.[1]

Du Pin indeed tells us in his Preface to his Edition of St. Optatus that until he had examined the MSS. he was inclined to reject all the Seventh Book as spurious, in consequence of the following considerations:

(I) St. Optatus himself gives the argument of his work as a whole, and says that he had divided it into six Books.[2] Moreover, St. Jerome writes expressly that St. Optatus wrote six Books against the Donatist calumnies.[3]

(II) In his First Book St. Optatus terms the sins of Betrayal and Schism *duo mala pessima*.[4] In certain parts of the Seventh Book, on the contrary, all kinds of excuses—some of them very far-fetched—are made for the sin of Betrayal, and the writer endeavours to tone down its guilt by all the means at his command.

[1] Three other short passages, which I have printed in square brackets, are in the same position as A, B, C (see p. 310).

[2] i, 7. [3] *Lib. de viris illustribus*, Cap. cxxi. [4] i, 13.

(III) It seemed to Du Pin at first that there was a certain difference of style between the Seventh and the first six Books.

But on discovering that the Seventh Book was found (without A, B, C) in all the manuscripts which he was able to consult, Du Pin was led to revise his opinion as to its genuineness.

The difficulty arising (I) from the fact that St. Optatus has himself mentioned his intention of writing six Books vanished upon further consideration, for (*a*) it is certain (as we have already stated [1]) that Optatus made additions to his original work in the time of Pope Siricius, and further (*b*) in the opening words of Book VII its author himself distinctly states that this Book is an afterthought, due to the fact that the Donatists did not profess themselves satisfied by that which he had already written.

With regard to (II) the change of tone concerning the sin of Betrayal—which had been Du Pin's chief difficulty—it is only to be found in the passages marked A and B. These Du Pin unhesitatingly rejects (whilst, in the end, with no less hesitation accepting the rest of the Book) as the work of a Donatist interpolator, referring to them in his Index as pseudo-Optatus.

As for (III) the dissimilarity of style, Du Pin remarks that this too is only to be observed in A and B. Indeed far from being dissimilar in style there is a very remarkable similarity in this respect between Book VII, speaking generally, and the other six Books; whilst for myself I fully agree with Ziwsa in thinking that even A and B are quite Optatian in style. From this point of view they seem to me to be clever forgeries—skilful imitations of the genuine work of St. Optatus, with which their author was evidently familiar.

The only remaining difficulty arises from the statement

[1] See Preface, p. xxii.

of St. Jerome to which we have already alluded. But is it not possible that St. Jerome was only acquainted with the First Edition of St. Optatus?[1] However this may be, Du Pin meets the difficulty by suggesting that when St. Jerome wrote, that which we now read as a connected whole, and call the Seventh Book of St. Optatus, was principally to be found in the shape of Appendices or additions, not to the completed work, but to several of the other Books regarded separately. To illustrate this idea, Du Pin points out that the Donatists very likely objected that two statements—both of them to be found in the First Book—that their Fathers were Betrayers, and that yet they were the Brethren of Catholics—were markedly inconsistent and even destructive of one another. 'If our Fathers were Betrayers,' we can well imagine that they urged, 'why do you call us Brethren, and why invite us to Communion?'[2] To this objection St. Optatus made his reply in the first three chapters of the Seventh Book.

All that we read in the two following chapters concerning 'flies about to die' and about Jamnes and Mambres should be referred to the end of the Second, or perhaps rather to the Fourth Book, where Donatist calumnies of a similar character are refuted.

The last two chapters (6 and 7) belong to the Third Book, to which they are an addition. As this seems to be, in the judgement of all, a fact established beyond doubt, I have already printed the translation of those chapters in their proper place at the end of Book III.

[1] St. Jerome's words are as follows: 'Optatus Afer Episcopus Milevitanus ex parte Catholica scripsit sub Valentiniano et Valente Principibus adversus Donatianae partis calumniam Libros sex.' We know that, on any hypothesis, St. Optatus wrote only six Books '*in the time of the Emperors Valentinianus and Valens.*' (Cf. Preface, p. xxii.)

[2] Cf. vii, 1: 'video adhuc vestras vel vestrorum provocationes pullulare, quas vos audio dicere, ad unam communionem non oportuisse quaeri, cum filios traditorum vos esse constiterit, ad ea pauca respondeam.'

I have thought it safer, however, (in this following not only Ziwsa but Du Pin himself,) to keep the first five chapters in the form of a separate Book, as we find them in the existing manuscripts.

A, B, C, etc., stand in a different position from the rest of the Book, not merely from the fact that they are wanting in most of the MSS.,[1] but above all from their character. Ziwsa indeed hesitates and thinks that they may perhaps be a kind of retractation by St. Optatus of the severe things which are to be found in his work, especially in his First Book. Everything written by Ziwsa concerning Optatus deserves, and must always receive, the most serious and respectful consideration. But it is certain that there is no sign whatever in Book VII (apart from A and B) of anything that expresses toning down or apology, much less retractation, by the author. There is no recognition of any contrast between previous and present statements. Ziwsa's theory must therefore remain, what after all he states it to be, a bare possibility and unverifiable hypothesis. Moreover, not only do A and B contradict the argument concerning the wickedness of Betrayal, which has been brought forward again and again in the previous Books, but they are also in opposition to the clear statement made in the Seventh Book itself at the end of its first chapter:

'*Tradere peccatum est.*'

They seem to me to be in their poverty of thought, lack of argumentative force, and general perversity of expression, quite unworthy of St. Optatus (as well as contrary to the consistent expression of his mind), and to be just what a cunning Donatist, if he had the opportunity, would be glad to insert in the work of his great adversary—or possibly they may have come from the hand of some unscrupulous Catholic, who, in his desire to make the

[1] They are only to be found in C and in the *Codex Tilianus*.

reconciliation of the Donatists as easy as possible, allowed himself to forget for the moment that no end, however good and desirable in itself, can justify the employment of dishonest means for its attainment. In any case, whatever their history, we may be quite sure that A and B failed of their purpose. They remain merely as a somewhat wearisome curiosity.

Ziwsa, who has no doubt as to the genuineness of the rest of Book VII, observes that in many places it is carelessly written, and partakes rather of the nature of a rough sketch, or of notes not yet worked up, than of a finished composition. But we must not press this too far, for, as Du Pin reminds us, St. Optatus in all the Books is very unequal in the polish of his work. Still, even though we bear this fact in mind, we shall have to admit that, if Book VII is really to be considered as a whole (and not a collection of chapters to be added to preceding books), the conclusion—wherever we place it (whether at the close of Chapter 5 or of Chapter 7)—is exceedingly abrupt and furnishes the most marked contrast in this respect to the highly polished termination of Book VI. That this was the end of the work as originally written, there can (as we have already stated) be no doubt.

With regard then to Book VII, problems exist with reference to its exact purpose and original arrangement which will never admit of certain and definite solution, but that (apart from A and B) it is the work of St. Optatus is no longer questioned by any critic. The MSS. evidence is too clear, and the similarity of thought and expression too striking, for doubt to be possible. For example, who that has ever read the undoubted

'Igitur negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram episcopalem esse conlatam,'

of ii, 2, can hesitate as to the

'Cathedram Petri . . . poteris adprobare mendacium ?'

of vii, 5? This *question* of the Seventh Book is simply the echo of the statement of the First Book. *Non potes negare = poteris adprobare?* (id est, *non poteris adprobare*) *mendacium.* We have here St. Optatus' summing up —his final cry of triumphant gladness. No forger could have had the first sentence of St. Optatus so stamped upon his mind, with its unmistakable ring, as to be able to change its form and yet reproduce it with such apparent unconsciousness and lack of effort, as forgery would here involve. And many similar instances might be adduced, which prove that, even independently of the weight of MSS. authority, this Seventh Book comes from the same brain and personality to which we owe the first six Books of St. Optatus against the Donatists.

# BOOK THE SEVENTH

IN THIS LAST BOOK IT IS SHOWN THAT THE CHILDREN OF THE BETRAYERS, WHOSE NAMES WERE GIVEN IN THE FIRST BOOK, MAY NOW, FOR THE SAKE OF UNITY, BE RECEIVED BACK INTO THE CATHOLIC COMMUNION.

I. That the Donatists can be received back into the Communion of the Church more easily than could have been their fathers who were guilty of Betrayal.

HAVING shown up the Betrayers and having pointed out the holy Church—having refuted the calumnies which you were wont to utter against us, and having exposed your sins—which have merited to be chidden by God—and your repetition of the Sacraments, and your gratuitous claims[1] and your violence, we ought now to finish our answers and statements[2]; but, since I perceive that, though the wood of malice has been cut down by the axes of truth, challenges are still sprouting[3] forth from you or from your friends, in which, as I hear, you maintain that, in consequence of your being known as the children of Betrayers, you ought not to be invited to the communion of unity[4] —to this let me say a few words in reply.

It is most true that the Catholic Church was sufficient for herself with her countless peoples in all

[1] *praesumptiones* (cf. i, 7; ii, 5 etc.), i.e. that the effects of Baptism were derived from the sanctity of their recipients, not from God.

[2] *responsorum dictorumque nostrorum.*

[3] *pullulare.*

[4] *ad unam communionem.*

countries [1]; she was sufficient for herself also in Africa, although here she is but in few places. But God was not pleased with your separation, for the members of one body had been torn asunder, and, against the Will of God, you, who are our brothers, wandered away from your brethren. Sentence had been passed at home [2] upon your fathers, that they who ought to have been expelled in consequence of their confession of Betrayal, should go forth of their own accord. No [formal] judgement was pronounced,[3] yet the effect of the sentence was obtained. They should have been cast off after the Betrayal, to which they owned in the Council in Numidia. But, not to give an opportunity for the display of their malice,[4] the severity of judgement was refrained from, and your ancestors of their own accord made their plans, in consequence of their guilt, to cover up their crime and depart with the appearance of pride—when they should have grieved and blushed for shame. For if at that time they had thought it right, for the sake of Peace, to enter into unity,[5] and had come to the Catholic Church of their own accord—unlike you, who are known to have been drawn [6] by the Will of

[1] *revera sufficiebat sibi Ecclesia Catholica habens innumerabiles populos in provinciis universis.*

[2] *domesticum iudicium.* At the Council of Cirta in Numidia.

[3] Against those who had consecrated Majorinus.

[4] *ne invidia esset.* Du Pin forgets the 'malice' against Secundus (cf. 'et cum ipse Secundus a Purpurio increparetur,' i, 14), when he understands 'ne invidia esset' to mean here 'that they might not be reproached with the expulsion of so many Bishops.'

[5] Balduinus in his second Edition inserted here the passage A which I print at the end of the Book (p. 298).

[6] *adductos* (cf. iii, 11: 'quem fides adduxerit').

God[1] to return whence you had wandered (though you are wandering still)—if, as I have said, they had come of their own accord to the Catholic Church, perhaps our fathers would have hesitated about receiving them, because they had been Betrayers; but we have cause for rejoicing, that none guilty of Betrayal have lived down to our times.

So to-day we find quite a new state of affairs, since we have to deal, not with them, but with you. Although it appears that a stain has passed from them to you by inheritance, nevertheless you cannot on this ground be held guilty together with your fathers, according to the Judgement of God, who has spoken by Ezekiel the prophet, saying:

> 'The soul of the father is Mine, and Mine is the soul of the son. The soul that sinneth, shall be punished alone.'[2]

And this was proved even in ancient times—at the very beginning of the world,[3] in that his father's sin did not belong to Seth, the son of Adam.[4] And

[1] *non sine voluntate Dei* (St. Optatus often uses this phrase, as also its equivalent *cum voluntate Dei*).

[2] Ez. xviii, 4.

[3] *in ipsis natalibus mundi.*

[4] *dum non pertinuit ad Seth, filium Adae, patris admissum.* From the theological point of view this has been considered the most difficult passage to be found in the works of St. Optatus. St. Augustine writes (*de Haer.* 19): '*Sethiani* nomen acceperunt a filio Adae, qui vocatus est Seth. Eum quippe honorant, sed fabulosa et haeretica vanitate.' The Sethitic legend is distinctly African. Julius Africanus is quoted as one of the first Christian writers to extol this Patriarch unduly, and the legend went on growing. Some, therefore, have thought that St. Optatus had received unawares a false tradition from heretical sources about Seth. Thus Casaubon writes with regard to this passage of Optatus: 'Non ego is iam, qui gravius quidquam de viro sancto pronuntiaverim. Id tantum

that no one might say that in another place it was written by the Lord that He would

'punish the sins of the fathers even unto the fourth generation'[1]—

—these are undoubtedly both words[2] of God, but both do not refer to one people. The first was said through Moses to a definite set of men, the second through Ezekiel to a different class. God, since He knew that the Jews would declare to Pontius Pilate:

'His Blood be upon us, and upon our children,'[3]

in His foreknowledge saw that what they would say, was, in comparison with the greatness of their sin, but little, and threatened the Jews themselves, in order that their crime might be expiated by adequate[4] penalties, saying that He would punish the offences of the fathers even to the fourth generation. So this word[5] belongs in a particular way to the Jews, and to them alone; but the other, in which God has deigned

dicam, vereri me, ne imprudenti et incauto illi haec exciderint, quae saevioris examinis acrimoniam aegre sustineant.' All the other commentators pass the passage over in silence. But is it not almost certain that St. Optatus had not the doctrine of original sin before his mind at all? With much probability it may be urged that the question here concerns not Adam *qua* father of the human race, but Adam considered as any other father. *In this sense* it is clear that Adam's sins were not attributed to his son Seth any more than are the sins of any other father attributed to any other son. We must always bear in mind that Optatus wrote before the rise of the Pelagian heresy. Still, the difficulty will remain unanswered: Why should Optatus in this connection have mentioned Seth rather than Abel, or even Cain?

[1] Ex. xx, 5. [2] *voces.* [3] Matt. xxvii, 25.
[4] *competentibus.* [5] *vox.*

to promise not to punish in sons any sins of their fathers, nor in fathers any faults perchance committed by their sons, belongs to Christians.[1]

Your fathers, who are proved to have done these things in the days of Unity, have fallen away from the number of the living, leaving you as it were an inherited stain, which God has already washed away by His Providence, when He made a distinction (as we have said above) between fathers and their sons. Accordingly, since Betrayal is a sin, your fathers must see to it, as to what answer they may make in the Judgement of God; but *your* sin it cannot be, since you are living in other times.

II. That good and evil will be found in the Church of God, and must be borne with to the Day of Judgement.

So it is that for long past we have desired to receive you into our Communion, because it was not you that sinned at that time, but your fathers.[2]

Nor ought any man to judge concerning another man, as though he were himself wholly without sin, since it has been written in the Gospel that Christ says:

'Judge not, that you be not judged.'[3]

And this above all, because it will not be possible to find one who is absolutely holy. For should any such there be, who are unable to sin, they are guilty of lying in the Lord's Prayer, if without reason they beg for pardon and say to God the Father:

[1] Here Balduinus inserted B, the second doubtful passage. I have printed it immediately after A (p. 305).

[2] And here C; it may be found on page 310.

[3] Matt. vii, 1; Luke vi, 37.

'Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us.'

So the Apostle John both shows the consciences of all men and discloses [1] his own with these words :

'If we shall say that we have not sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us,' [2]—

a saying the reason of which we have explained more clearly in our Fourth Book. But grant that there are some who have been made perfect with complete sanctity, it is not lawful for them to be without brethren, whom they are taught not to repel by the precepts of the Gospel, wherein we find described a field—that is the whole world, in which is the Church [3] and Christ the Sower, who gives wholesome precepts.[4] On the other hand there is an evil man—that is the Devil,[5] who sows cruel [6] sins not in the light, but in the

[1] *resignet.* CGv *designet.* [2] 1 John i, 8.

[3] *ager, qui est totus orbis, in quo est Ecclesia.* If St. Augustine at the Conference at Carthage had remembered and employed these careful words of St. Optatus—'the field in which is the Church,' he would have been saved a tiresome discussion with his Donatist adversaries. The Donatists naturally and triumphantly replied to the argument of the Catholics that the tares had to grow up with the wheat in the Field, and that the Field is the Church : 'Oh no, on the contrary, the Maker of the world Himself has said that *the Field is the world.* Now "the world has not known the Father." But if (as you say) the Church is the Field, it is also the world, for "the Field is the world." Therefore the Church has not known the Father ! Which is absurd.' To this ingenious syllogism St. Augustine had to rely upon a long explanation as to the different meaning of the word 'world' in Holy Scripture (*Gesta Coll. Carthag. Diei* iii, cclxv—cclxxxi ; *Brev. Coll.* iii, 10). No exception could have been taken to the statement of Optatus 'the Church is *in* the world.' Had it been used, the Donatists would have been deprived of one of their many opportunities of wasting time.

[4] *praecepta salutaria.*

[5] *homo est malus, id est diabolus.*

[6] *inportuna peccata.* In contrast with the wholesome precepts

darkness.[1] Different kinds of seeds come to birth[2] in one field. Similarly, in the Church there is not a mass of souls all alike.[3] The field receives good seeds or bad—the seeds are different. But there is One Creator of all souls—one Lord of the field. There are Two who sow seeds where the tares are born, but the field has one Lord, the Lord God Himself. His is the earth; His are the good seeds; His is also the rain.

Accordingly, we have consented to receive in unity you, who have been drawn[4] [to the Catholic Church], for we are not free either to separate or to reject even sinners who have been born with us in one field [and] have received nourishment[5] from one water[6]—that is from the one Baptism; even as the Apostles were not free to separate the tares from the wheat (since separation is impossible without destruction[7]), lest, whilst pulling up what ought to be pulled up, that which ought

('praecepta salutaria') of Christ, concerning which Optatus has just written. (Christ's precepts save us; sins harm us cruelly.) *Inportunitas* has been used in the sense of *inmanitas* in ii, 18 (cf. however iii, 7, where *inportune* is used for *unseasonably*, which may perhaps be the meaning here—'unseasonable sins').

[1] *per tenebras.*

[2] *nascuntur diversa semina.*

[3] *in Ecclesia non est similis turba animarum.*

[4] *adductos*, sc. ad Ecclesiam Catholicam (cf. last chapter: 'ad Ecclesiam Catholicam . . . non sine voluntate Dei adductos').

[5] *nutritos.*

[6] *una pluvia nutritos.* Thus Du Pin. Ziwsa places a comma after *pluvia*, making *una pluvia* depend not upon *nutritos*, but upon preceding *natos* = 'born with us from one water—that is to say, nourished from the one Baptism.' It must be admitted that, strictly speaking, not *nourishment* but *birth* comes from Baptism, but on the other hand seeds are not *born* from rain. For this reason I prefer on the whole Du Pin's punctuation, and have translated accordingly.

[7] *sine exterminio.*

not to be, should be, trodden down. In like manner Christ has commanded that both His own seeds, and those which belong to the other,[1] should grow in His field throughout the entire world, in which there is the One Church.[2]

After all have ripened[3] together, shall come the Day of Judgement, which is the harvest of souls. Then there shall sit the Judge, the Son of God, who recognises what is His own and what is the other's.[4] His it shall be to choose what He may gather in His barn,[5] and what deliver over to the burning—whom He shall condemn[6] to torments that know no end,[7] and upon whom He may bestow[8] the rewards which He has promised.

Let us recognise that we all are men; let no one usurp to himself the power of Judgement that belongs to God. For if any Bishop were to claim it all for himself,[9] pray, what will there be for Christ to do in Judgement? It should be enough for a man not to be guilty of sins of his own, without wishing to be judge of the sins of another.

[1] *aliena.*

[2] *in agro Suo per totum orbem terrarum, in quo est Una Ecclesia.*

[3] *post crementa communia. Crementum* (literally *increase*) is an unusual Low Latin variant of *incrementum.*

[4] *quid est Suum et quid alienum.* [5] *in horreo.*

[6] *destinet.* [7] *interminata.* [8] *repraesentet.*

[9] *si sibi totum vindicet.* The context tells us that the *totum* here refers to the power of judgement and especially of *separation.* If any Bishop were now to separate all sinners from the Visible Church, there could not be that separation by Christ, on the Day of Judgement, of the tares from the wheat, and of the goats from the sheep, of which we read in the Gospels. It is hardly necessary to say that the Church has never at any time claimed to judge *in foro interno,* that is, concerning the conscience or interior state and future lot of any man.

So it is our declaration [1] [not only] that we do not reject you, [but even that for the sake of Peace we would not have rejected your fathers, if it had come to pass in their day that unity was accomplished].[2] For it would be a sin for us Bishops to do now, that which was not done by the Apostles, who were not permitted either to separate seeds or to pluck up the tares from the wheat.

III. The Donatists might have appealed to the example of the Apostle Peter to ask pardon for themselves.

But even if the Catholic Church should hesitate about receiving you, ought you not to have striven to attain the pattern of unity [3]? But you have shrunk from bringing forward the examples to be found in the Gospel, as for instance what has been written concerning the person of the most blessed Peter, where we may read a description of the way in which unity is to be retained or procured.[4] Without doubt it is evil to do anything against a prohibition, but it is worse not to have unity when you may. We see that this unity was preferred to punishment [5] by Christ Himself, who chose that all His disciples should be in unity rather than punish [6] a sin against Himself. For, as He did

[1] *professio.*

[2] The words in square brackets are only to be found in C and *Codex Tilianus.*

[3] *unitatis adsequi formam. Unitatis forma* = the idea of unity presented by Christ and externally realised in the Visible Church. It is very difficult to translate *forma*, as used by St. Optatus, into English (cf. v, 5 *formam baptizandi*; i, 21 *exemplorum formam*; v, 3 *formam humilitatis*; vii, 6 *iudicandi formam*; v, 14 *quam formam habet mens*). It is obviously impossible to render *forma* in these passages by the same English word, though the idea is the same in all of them—a rule or concept, clothed, as it were, before our eyes, in order that we may adhere to it.

[4] *forma unitatis retinendae vel faciendae.*

[5] *vindictae suae.* [6] *vindicare.*

not wish to be denied, He declared that whosoever should deny Him before men him would He deny before His Father,[1] [but He did not declare that He would punish one who should give up any Scripture, since it is more serious to deny Him who spoke, than to give up the words which He has spoken].[2] And though this has been thus written, nevertheless, for the sake of unity, blessed Peter (for whom it would have been enough if after his denial he had obtained pardon only) both deserved to be placed over all the Apostles, and alone received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, which he was to communicate to the rest.[3] So from

[1] Cf. Matt. x, 33; Luke xii, 9.

[2] The passage in square brackets is a clumsy interpolation. It is, however, to be found in C and *Codex Tilianus*.

[3] *bono unitatis beatus Petrus . . . et praeferri Apostolis omnibus meruit et claves regni caelorum communicandas ceteris solus accepit.* After *communicandas* some Gallican and Anglican authorities have supplied *a Christo*. Thus Dr. Pusey (Note R to Tertullian, Oxford Translation of the Fathers). Similarly Mr. Denny (*op. cit.*, n. 1165) writes 'that is, as Bossuet says, that Peter *first* received the keys which were afterwards to be imparted to the Apostles (Matt. xviii and John xx), but to be imparted not by Peter, but by Christ, as is clear.' Dr. Pusey sends us to Du Pin. Now it is curious that in his edition of St. Optatus Du Pin has no note whatsoever on this passage. Dr. Pusey, however, refers to his *De Antiqua Ecclesiae disciplina Dissertationes historicae*, where we read as follows (*Diss.* iv, cap. i): 'communicandas ceteris (*id est quod Christus commendaturus erat ceteris*).' But it should be noted that neither Du Pin nor Bossuet nor Denny say one single word in support of their view that *a Christo* should be understood after the word *communicandas* in this passage of Optatus. It is simple assertion, to which Bossuet adds the words 'as is clear' (*Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, pars III, lib. viii, cap. xii, tom. ii, p. 90); on the other hand, it should be observed that we nowhere read either in Matt. xviii or in John xx—the passages referred to by Bossuet—that Christ gave the Keys to the other Apostles. With regard to the words of St. Optatus we may note in the first place that

this example it is given us to understand that for the sake of unity sins should be buried, since the most blessed Apostle Paul says that charity [1] can cover a multitude of sins :

'Bear your burdens together,' [2]

he says ; and in another place :

'Charity is high-souled,[3] charity is kind, charity envieth not, charity is not puffed up, charity seeketh not the things that are her own.' [4]

we shall search in vain for any passage where he states that Christ gave the Keys to 'the other Apostles'; on the contrary Optatus says expressly, both here and in i, 10 ('ut haeretici omnes neque claves habeant, quas *solus* Petrus accepit'), that Peter *alone* received them; so that for the Gallican interpretation of this passage to be possible we should have to change the word *solus* to *primus*—the *alone* of Optatus for the *first* of Bossuet; secondly that, though Optatus uses the verb *communicare* in eighteen places, in every other case it is used intransitively—twice absolutely and fifteen times with the dative—in the technical sense of ecclesiastical communion (to be in communion with). Here however we find the usual classical construction, *communicare aliquid* (here *claves*) *cum aliquo* or *alicui* (here *ceteris*). *Communicare aliquid alicui* always means in Latin to give something (e.g. information, power, here the Keys) to someone else, without ceasing to possess it oneself—to make it a common possession shared between oneself and the other (cf. Liv. *Lib.* xxiii, 5 : 'Civitatem nostram magnae parti vestrum dedimus communicavimusque vobiscum,' and Cicero *De Inv.* ii, 39 : 'Praemia virtutis non oportet cum improbis communicari'). This is undeniable and forces us to see that the gloss *a Christo* is impossible—apart from the exigencies of controversy—and does violence to the text, to which indeed it is in direct opposition. The meaning is clea beyond all doubt—'the Keys which he was to communicate to the rest.' St. Peter had to impart to the other Apostles, for them to use also, the Keys which, as their 'Head' (cf. *infra*), he had himself alone received from Christ.

[1] Once more St. Optatus identifies 'charity' in this famous passage with unity (cf. iii, 8 : 'si beatus Paulus . . . pronuntiat se nihil esse, nisi *caritatem* habuerit, videte an non dicantur martyres . . . *caritatis* [i.e. unitatis] desertores').

[2] *onera vestra invicem sustinete.* Cf. Gal. vi, 2.

[3] *magnanimis.*

[4] 1 Cor. xiii, 4, 5.

And he has said well. For he had seen all these things in the other Apostles, who for the sake of unity, through charity, would not withdraw from the communion of Peter—of the man, that is to say, who had denied Christ.[1] But if their love of innocence had been greater than the gain [2] of peace and unity, they would have said that they ought not to hold communion with Peter, who had denied his Master and the Son of God, the Lord. They might, as has been said, not have held communion with the most blessed Peter; it would have been possible for them to quote against him the words of Christ, who had declared that He would deny before His Father whosoever should have denied Him before men. We ought industriously [3] to pay attention to the inward meaning of this.[4] Whilst I say a few words concerning it, may the blessed Saint Peter himself pardon me,[5] if I mention that which we read and know that he did. I hesitate to say that so great holiness as his has sinned, but he himself proved this fact, when he grieved bitterly and wept copiously, since he would neither have grieved nor wept, had he not committed any offence. Now the Head of the Apostles might surely have so governed himself, as to have done nothing, on account of which

[1] Harnack quotes this sentence and observes: 'That is still a dangerous fundamental thought of Catholicism at the present day.'

[2] *utilitas.* [3] *diligenter.* [4] *ad quam formam.*

[5] *ipsius Sancti Petri beatitudo veniam tribuat.* In the same spirit St. Augustine carefully praises St. Cyprian before combating his views as to Rebaptism of heretics (e.g. *De Baptis. con. Donat.* vii, 1: 'Et beatus Cyprianus quidem iam corpore quod corrumpitur non aggravante animam nec deprimente terrena habitatione sensum multa cogitantem serenius aspicit veritatem quam meruit adipisci per caritatem talem. Adiuvet itaque nos orationibus suis in istius carnis mortalitate' etc.).

he should grieve. But many faults [1] are seen in this one case of his,[2] for this reason, that it might be shown that for the sake of unity all things should be reserved for God.[3] And I know not whether in any other man this kind of sin could be of such weight, as was clearly the case in blessed Peter. For whoever during some persecution perchance denied the Son of God, will be seen, when compared with blessed Peter, to have sinned more lightly, if he denied Him whom he had not seen, if he denied Him whom he had not recognised, if he denied Him to whom he had made no promise, if he denied but once. For in blessed Peter this kind of sin was broadened out [4]—in the first place, when Christ asked of all, whom did men say that He was, one said 'Elias,' another said 'the Prophet'; then we read that Christ said:

'Whom do you say that I am?'

and Peter said to Him:

'Thou art the Son of the Living God' [5]—

on account of which recognition [6] he deserved to be praised by Christ, [because this he had said through the prompting [7] of God the Father [8]]. Behold, when the others did not recognise the Son of God, He was recognised by Peter alone.

In the second place, when Christ said on the eve of His Passion:

[1] *multa errata.* [2] *in uno titulo eius.*

[3] *omnia debere Deo servari*, sc. for the Judgement of God. (Cf. i, 14: 'Secundus consilium accepit . . . ut talem caussam Deo servaret . . . hi dixerunt talem caussam Deo debere reservari.')

[4] *dilatatum est.* [5] Matt. xvi, 15–17.

[6] *pro qua agnitione.* [7] *instinctu Dei Patris.*

[8] The passage in square brackets is to be found only in C and *Codex Tilianus.*

'Behold I am bound, and you all flee,'[1]

when the others kept silence, he alone promised that he would not go back.[2] Out of His Foreknowledge, the Son of God said:

'O Peter, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny Me thrice.'[3]

Something else was added to the weight of his sin—a promise, which he would not fulfil. After Christ was brought into the house of Caiaphas, out of so great a number no one was questioned—to fill up the measure of his transgression—save blessed Peter. When questioned, at first he denies; when questioned, he denies a second time; thirdly, he said that he knew Christ not at all; and the cock crew, not to mark the time by his crowing, but that blessed Peter might recognise how he had sinned. At last he grieved bitterly and wept copiously.

Behold (as we have said above), when the others did not recognise he alone recognised, when the others made no promises he alone promised, when the others did not deny once he alone denied and that three times, but yet, for the sake of unity, he was not to be separated from the number of the Apostles.[4] From which we understand that all things were ordered by the Providence of the Saviour, that Peter should receive the Keys. The way of malice was stopped up, that the Apostles might not conceive in their minds that they were free to judge, and condemn with severity, him who had denied Christ. So many guiltless ones

[1] John xvi, 32; Matt. xxvi, 31. [2] *non recessurum.*
[3] Matt. xxvi, 34.
[4] *de numero apostolorum separari non meruit.*

are standing upright,[1] and the sinner receives the Keys, that the work of unity[2] might receive its pattern.[3] It was provided that the sinner should open for the guiltless,[4] lest the guiltless might close [the gates] against sinners, and thus the unity which is necessary could not be.[5]

If you had mentioned these things, and asked for communion, how[6] could the Catholic Church, our Mother, have hesitated to receive you in her Bosom,[7] since it is certain that you are not Betrayers, but the sons of Betrayers?

IV. That Eccles. x, 1 should be referred to Donatists rather than to Catholics.

Now some of your party in their desire to point us out to their people as worthy of contempt, mix up in their discourses that which was said by the Prophet Solomon concerning 'the flies that are soon to die':

'Flies that are soon to die banish the sweetness of oil,'[8]

and call us 'flies that are soon to die.' That liquid[9] which is seasoned by[10] the Name of Christ, and, after

[1] *stant tot innocentes* = are standing unfallen (cf. ii, 25). (Possibly *stant* = are standing by—so Ziwsa in Index s.v. *stare*.)

[2] *unitatis negotium.* [3] *formaretur* (cf. p. 283, note 3).

[4] It was provided that St. Peter ('the sinner') should open for the other Apostles ('the guiltless').

[5] A schismatic or other sinner could not comply with the command of living within the Unity of the Church ('the unity which is necessary'), unless recovery were possible for him on repentance. So Peter holds the Keys, and through his ministry the gates of the Church on earth and of Paradise above are always open for the sinner who will turn from sin and seek the admittance which will never be denied him.

[6] *quando. Quando* in several places is used by St. Optatus to = How (e.g. ii, 21).

[7] *pio sinu.* [8] Eccles. x, 1.

[9] *illum scilicet liquorem.* [10] *ex.*

it has been seasoned is called Chrism, they call 'Oil.'[1] Before consecration[2] it is still by nature simple oil; it becomes sweet, when it is seasoned from[3] the Name of Christ.

There are then three things, of which the Prophet Solomon has made mention—*the oil, the sweetness* and *the flies that are soon to die* which destroy *the sweetness.* These three things have their places in due order. In the first place is the oil, in the second is the sweetness that has been produced,[4] in the third the dying flies which banish the sweetness. Let then whoever amongst you brings forward such an argument[5] prove why he calls us 'flies that are soon to die.' You think that you have the power of consecration[6] which gives its sweetness to the oil—you have then both the oil and its sweetness. Do we 'banish' your oil,[7] so that you may with reason[8] call us 'flies which are soon to die'? That which is yours remains with you. And if anyone passes over from you to us, he is left by us, as he was sent away by you.[9] So how can

[1] Albaspinaeus observes that the heretics of his day in like manner called the holy Chrism 'oil' out of contempt. This fact is familiar to all students of the letters of both the English and foreign Reformers. They habitually wrote of Ordination as 'greasing.'

[2] *antequam fiat.* [3] *de.*

[4] *suavitas de confectione*, i.e. through consecration.

[5] *quisquis est talis tractator ex vobis.*

[6] *si apud vos putatis esse confectionem.* Catholic writers often use the phrase *conficere sacramentum*, and even *conficere Corpus Domini.*

[7] Catholics never questioned the validity of Donatist orders. Consequently such an Episcopal act as the consecration of Chrism (however illicitly) was validly performed. [8] *merito.*

[9] The baptised man was regarded as baptised, the priest as a priest, the Bishop as a Bishop, etc.

you say that we are 'flies soon to die, which corrupt the sweetness of the oil,' when, [coming] after you, we do no such deed? [1]

Again if you say that the sweetness of the oil can be corrupted by us, either we can effect something, and give sweetness to the oil, or if, as you maintain, we are not able to effect anything, then the oil still remains such as it was by nature.[2] How then do you say that we are 'flies soon to die, which corrupt the sweetness of the oil'?

Accordingly, the oil, before it is consecrated by us, is such as it was by nature.[3] After it has been consecrated,[4] it is able to receive sweetness from the Name of Christ. How can we by the same action both consecrate and corrupt? [5]

It follows that, if the oil be sweet of its own nature, there is nothing more left for men to effect, when it is consecrated in the Name of Christ.

The same workman cannot at the same time make two things which are repugnant and opposite to each other.

When we, in your absence, consecrate, we do not corrupt. But if we do corrupt, who had before us consecrated anything for us to corrupt? Wherefore —that the saying of the Prophet (if it be such) may not remain without application—understand that *you* are *the flies that are soon to die.* For you have

[1] By re-baptising or re-confirming or re-ordaining converts from Donatism.

[2] *oleum tale esse, quale et natum est.* Cf. *natus est hoc facere* in late Latin (it is his nature to do this), and the classical *fruges consumere nati* (whose nature it is).

[3] *conficiatur.* [4] *confectum.*

[5] *quomodo possumus uno facto et conficere et corrumpere?*

banished what it had not by nature, but by consecration, since we read that what is sweet is not capable of corruption by nature,[1] for oil is simple and has its own one and distinctive name. Once it has been consecrated it is called Chrism, in which there is the sweetness which, having shut out [2] the hardness of sins, softens the outward skin of the conscience,[3] which renews a gentle mind, which prepares a habitation for the Holy Spirit, so that He may be hither invited and, after bitterness has been put to flight, may deign here gladly to dwell. This [4] is the sweetness of the oil which flies that are soon to die are able to corrupt. If we were to banish the oil which you had consecrated, with reason might you call us flies that are soon to die, but so long as we preserve that which you have anointed even as we find it, we cannot be flies that are soon to die; but whilst you, driven by the storms of jealousy, falling, as it were, [like flies] into the oil, banish (by rebaptising) the sweetness of that oil, which has been consecrated in the Name of Christ—from which good morals should be seasoned,[5] and the light of the mind be enkindled to a health-giving [6] and true understanding—you are banishing the reality in which was the oil and sweetness.[7]

But how have we been able to corrupt a sweetness, which no man before us produced by consecration? You have led men astray. You have rebaptised.

[1] *suavitas enim legitur non natura posse corrumpi* (cf. supra).
[2] *exclusa.* [3] *cutem conscientiae.*
[4] sc. sweetness derived from consecration.
[5] *unde condiventur mores.* [6] *salutarem.*
[7] *vos exterminatis rem ubi oleum fuit et suavitas.*

You have anointed a second time.[1] Oh for shame! To your own destruction have you—like flies, which destroy even whilst they are dying—banished that which had been consecrated in the Name of Christ. Now, sin which has no pardon is death. It has been written that:

'he who shall have sinned against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven unto him, either in this world or in the world to come.'[2]

Wherefore, inasmuch as you untruly call us *flies*, and hasten to annul[3] all that we have done, and say that we ought to be rejected or despised, claiming sanctity for yourselves alone, you put forward your innocence, as the ground for promising that you can forgive the sins of others. You see therefore that it was not of us, as you argue, but of yourselves that the most blessed Apostle Paul has said:

'There shall be men, lovers of themselves, covetous, praising themselves, proud, blasphemers, not obeying

[1] You have repeated not only Baptism, but also Confirmation.

[2] Matt. xii, 22. Casaubon thinks that St. Optatus could not have made this quotation, and that it slipped in from a marginal note. It is quite true that the object of St. Optatus, which was to show that the Donatists were not only *muscae* (flies) but also *muscae moriturae* (flies that were about to die), would have been attained without the quotation. It would have been enough for his purpose to have said that their rebaptising was a great sin and that 'sin without pardon—until it is pardoned—is death.' But unhappily he has already said (v, 3) that rebaptising (as involving a certain exorcism of the Holy Ghost) is that sin against the Holy Ghost for which there is no forgiveness in this world, or in the world to come. So hard was it to kill rigorism in the African Church, that we find it even in unexpected places. Still, we rejoice to find that St. Optatus is not always consistent with himself in this terrible severity. We have seen how clear he was that even these rebaptisers should have been reconciled with the Church, had they been willing.

[3] *dissolvere.*

parents, ungrateful, wicked ; not guarding peace, without affection, detractors, not gentle, without kindness,[1] and the rest.'

V. That the Donatists and not the Catholics resembled Jamnes and Mambres.

Now, to turn to the fact that you have thought fit to take upon yourself the character of Moses, who, as the Apostle Paul tells us, was opposed by Jamnes and Mambres [2]—if this be so, what is the truth, that may be found with you, which the Catholic Church opposes ?

Or, what is there with us which you can prove to be a lie ? Is it that we are in one communion with the whole world ? Will you be able to prove that this is a lie ? Is it that we keep and defend the true and one Creed ? Will you be able to prove that this is a lie ? Will you be able to prove that the Chair of Peter is a lie—and the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, which were granted him by Christ, with which we are in communion ? [3]

[1] 2 Tim. iii, 2. [2] Cf. 2 Tim. iii, 8 ; Ex. vii, 11.

[3] *Cathedram Petri et claves regni caelorum a Christo concessas, ubi est nostra societas, numquid poteris adprobare mendacium ?* (cf. ii, 23 : ' Negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma . . . *societate* concordat '). The Donatists claimed that they possessed the truth. To this Optatus opposed the authority of the Catholic Church and set out the grounds of Catholic security in three pertinent questions :

(*a*) Is it a lie (a delusion) to appeal to the fact of communion with the Catholic Church throughout the world ? ' *Is it a delusion that we are in one communion with the whole* [*Catholic*] *world ?* '

(*b*) Is it a delusion that we keep and guard the Creed ? ' *Is it a delusion that we keep and defend the true and one Creed ?* '

(*c*) Is the Chair of Peter a delusion ? ' *But you cannot deny that you know that Peter established his Chair at Rome.* ' Or, is it a delusion that we are in communion with that Chair ? Or, is it, perhaps, a delusion that Christ gave the Keys of Heaven to Peter ?—the Keys of Heaven which, through our communion with the Chair of Peter, we share (' *ubi est nostra societas* ' ; cf. i, 12 ; ii, 4 ; ii, 9).

In the very passage of Scripture which you have mentioned, consider the order of the actions of the persons themselves, and pay attention as to which was the first. Yes, surely, Jamnes and Mambres who by their false artifices strove to fight against Moses and the truth, are in the second place. Moses, whose miracles they attempted in vain to impugn, was before them.[1]

As Moses is the first, so also is the Catholic Church the first.[2] As Jamnes and Mambres fought against and opposed Moses, so also do you in rebellion fight against the true Catholic Church.[3] Why, then, is it that you [4] have wished to change names between yourselves and us excepting that thou [5] mightest prove thyself on a level with thy colleagues? For there are some of your party, who, having forgotten, or being

Is this all a falsehood—a mere delusion? ('*Numquid poteris adprobare mendacium?*')

Such is the argument of Optatus. He appealed just as Catholics appeal to-day (and as they always have appealed):

1. To communion with the Catholic Church in other lands,
2. To the possession of the Creed,
3. To communion with the Chair of Peter.

This is the ultimate assurance of safety for a Catholic that he is in the true Church of Christ—the *Soliditas Cathedrae Petri*. This is no freak of the imagination (*mendacium*). Here beyond all doubt we find and here we possess the great reality.

[1] Moses came first, before Pharaoh, and though Jamnes and Mambres worked the same miracles, yet Moses had precedence and prescriptive right. (Cf. Exod. vii, 11.) St. Optatus here passes to another great argument for the Catholic Church. It is 'in possession.'

[2] *ut Moyses prior est, sic et Catholica prior est.*

[3] *rebelles contra veram Catholicam militatis* (cf. 'contra Cathedram Petri sacrilegio militatis,' ii, 5).

[4] plural—Donatists in general.

[5] singular—Parmenian in particular.

ignorant of past times, say against us things which belong of right to those men who, having already fallen away from the Catholic Church,[1] consecrated Majorinus—that is to say to the authors of Schism and Betrayal. Because they still preserved Peace, before they banished unity,—well-pleasing to God—they were the light of the world, and with reason were they termed the salt of the earth. So long as they taught Peace, they were still called the sons of Peace. Before they were puffed up, they were blessed in their poverty of spirit, and were part of the savour. Whilst they were meek, they were blessed—they were part of the savour. Whilst they were just, they were blessed—they were part of the savour. Whilst they were sons of Peace, they were blessed—they were the whole of the savour. After they bestowed the riches of error upon their breath and lungs [2] and made the schism, they were seen to be cruel and without mercy; whilst they impiously tore asunder the members of the Church following after wickedness, they held the Kingdom of God in contempt, and, dividing the Church, were unwilling to be in Peace, they became salt that has been spoiled,[3] from which nothing could be seasoned to please God with its sweetness.[4] And since your first leaders were thus wicked, some of your colleagues

[1] *iamdudum de Catholica lapsi.*

[2] *errovis divitias dederunt spiritui et pulmonibus suis.*

[3] *sal infatuatum.* Cf. S. Aug. *De Serm. Dom.* i, 6: 'si sal *infatuatum* fuerit, in quo salietur . . . ergo ad nihilum valet sal *infatuatum*, nisi ut mittatur foras, et calcetur ab hominibus . . .qui persecutionem timendo *infatuatur*, calcatur ab hominibus,' and S. Hilar. *in Matt.* iv: 'si sal *infatuatum* fuerit, ad nihilum valet id quod salietur.'

[4] St. Optatus forgot for a moment that salt does not produce sweetness.

argue in a wrong-headed way,[1] so that they say that those were foolish, who, quitting the Schism, having, however late, recognised the truth and their Mother the Catholic Church, followed after Peace. Some of your party think that these men made a mistake; they consider that, as it were having lost their savour,[2] they departed from wisdom. From which it is clear that you all make the same mistake in your application of names. For you have compared both Jamnes and Mambres to peace-loving Catholics, and yourselves, who are schismatics, you have compared to Moses—something very far removed from the truth. And some of your foolish colleagues have thought well to pass judgement on the wise, so as to say that the lovers of Peace have become fools and have refused to understand that their own fathers have, through their dissension, lost their savour[3].[4]

[1] *aliter.*

[2] *quasi infatuatos* (with reference to *sal infatuatum* supra).

[3] *infatuatos esse.*

[4] Chapters VI and VII have been placed at the end of Book III, to which they belong as an Appendix (v. p. 175–179).

A (see p. 276, l. 21).

If at that time they had thought it right, for the sake of Peace, to enter into unity, even they would not have been repelled by the Church, since in their case dire straits[1] made excuse for the will. For not any of them had been voluntarily Betrayers; otherwise, this sin of theirs might have been likened to other transgressions.

Whatever God has willed not to be done, He has forbidden by His Mouth—even as He has said:

'Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery,'[2]

and the rest. He might have also forbidden what was done by your fathers. But since that which the mind does is one thing, whereas that which circumstances bring about is quite another, whatever is within the power of man to effect is fit matter for prohibition, but whatever evil deeds are brought about through necessity may not be blamed with much violence. Therefore wilful sins receive punishment, those done through necessity receive pardon.

The murderer, who is not compelled to his crime by any man, is free to do the deed; he is also free to leave it undone; the adulterer, who is compelled by no one from outside, can commit adultery or not, as he chooses. Similarly with other matters of like nature, where free choice exists.

Accordingly, when those things are done, which have been forbidden, they are destined for judgement; when things which have not been forbidden are done through some sort of necessity, perchance He who was unwilling

[1] *necessitas*. Here this word does not mean *necessity* literally, but rather *dire straits*.

[2] Exodus xx, 13, 14.

to forbid them, may deign easily to pardon. So with regard to this crime[1] which might have been brought against your fathers as a deadly[2] offence—if at that time they had been exposed, or brought to judgement concerning it, they might have come to their own rescue by alleging more than one example. For we read that in the first times[3] the Tables of the Law were broken,[4] also that Books were given up or cut and burned,[5] but that no one was condemned.

If (as I have just said) your fathers' deeds had then been laid bare—if they could have been brought to judgement—without doubt they might have pleaded that they had done no more than was done by Moses the Lawgiver. Although necessity and free will have no resemblance, but are contrary to one another, [yet] since (so far as the legal name is concerned) there was the same case for your fathers as for Moses, your fathers might have said[6] that they, through necessity, did what Moses had of his free will done first. In his indignation with the people, he did not consider that God had written with His own finger—and what has been written in heaven is more than what has been written on earth—nor did he reflect that what the Finger of God has written is not the same[7] as that which has been written with a pen made by the hand of a man. Moses carried what he had received in the Cloud, and your fathers gave up what they had made for payment. With reason, then, might your fathers have defended themselves, arguing that it was not a deadly[8] offence, if anyone of them had done, when

[1] There is here an anacoluthon in the Latin.

[2] *capitale.* [3] *primis temporibus.*

[4] Cf. Ex. xxxii, 19; Deut. ix, 17. [5] *vel incisi et incensi.*

[6] *cum eodem nomine legis parentum vestrorum et Moysi una fuerit caussa, possent dicere parentes vestri* etc. Both Du Pin and Ziwsa print a full stop after *caussa*, but this punctuation seems to obscure the sense.

[7] *unum.* [8] *capitale.*

terrified by an excessive fear, what Moses had done through anger. Neither do we read that the Lord was wroth with Moses, nor that He avenged those broken Tables which He had written with His own Hand, nor that Moses was termed a sinner or punished. The Law came from God in the same way that water comes from a fountain, or that fruit [1] is cut from a tree without injury to its root. That which has been used [2] is not lost, provided that it is safely preserved in its source.[3] Similarly, Moses was not condemned after he had scattered and broken to pieces [4] the Tables of the Law. And subsequently he was called back, went up Mount Sinai;[5] was permitted to speak with God, and received a second time the Law now renewed, as has been disclosed by the title of the book, which in Greek is called Deuteronomy.[6] You see that in the Law that which had been preserved safe in its Source was not lost. But lest anyone should suppose that Moses had merit in a certain boldness with God due to his converse with Him, and that it was for this cause that God was not displeased with him, and that, this being so, it was fitting for friendship always to demand and receive its

[1] *poma.*

[2] *quod erogatum est.* [3] *si in origine sua salvum est.*

[4] *post tabulas sparsas legis et comminutas.*

[5] Cf. Ex. xxxiv, 2; Deut. x, 1.

[6] *et secundum legem innovatam accepit, quam prodiit titulus libri, qui Graeco vocabulo Deuteronomos scribitur.* For *prodiit* Casaubon conjectured *prodidit.* I have translated *secundum* as an adverb = *secundo*, though for this it is hard to find authority. Ziwsa in his index says that *secundum* is here a preposition, but it is very difficult thus to get even fair sense. 'He received the renewed Law in accordance with the Law' hardly seems satisfactory. I am much tempted to think that *secundum* is a mistake for *secundam.* The reference to Deuteronomy makes this to me almost certain. ('The very title Deuteronomy,' our author seems to say, 'bears witness to the second Law.') But as *secundam* has no MS. authority, and has occurred to no one else, I have not ventured to translate it in the text. It is hardly necessary to say that in Greek *Deuteronomy* means 'The Second Law.'

reward and fruit—why then was he afterwards punished for another offence? Was it not to show that what he had done in his wrath was a venial [1] offence? The Law was safe in God,[2] even after it, together with the Tables of Stone, had been broken by man; whereas [on the other occasion] through not rendering that reverence which was due from man, Moses deserved the penalty of dying in the midst of his journey, so that he entered not into the Land of Promise [3]—from which it is clear that something, which, as in the present example,[4] could escape without punishment,[5] cannot be looked upon as a very great sin.

If this had been pleaded by your fathers, who could have refused them communion? And again, if they had put forward instances, which followed afterwards, in which we read of what happened when the renewed [6] Law was kept in the Ark, and the people of Israel were conquered in battle. The Law, which by the advice of the people [7] was borne in the Ark against the enemy, could not be guarded by the priests themselves and by the rest of the children of Israel, but far from being carried away [in safety] was given up [8] to the enemy.[9] When the Law had been given up,[8] those who had urged its being brought forward fled away in panic, and we do not read that they suffered any punishment in consequence. If this example had been alleged [10] by your fathers, who would have been able to repel them from his communion? Again, (what would have happened) if your leaders had not kept silence concerning those cases in which we read that Baruch gave up to Judin the Scribe the book of the

[1] *leve.* [2] Cf. Rom. vii, 12.

[3] Cf. Num. xx, 12; Deut. i, 37.

[4] *in praesenti exemplo.* Casaubon suggests *in praecepta* = against the Commandments. But *in praesenti exemplo* means as contrasted with the later offence of striking the rock.

[5] *inpune.* [6] *innovata lex.* Cf. p. 300, note 6.

[7] *populorum.* [8] *tradita.* [9] Cf. 1 Kings v, 1.

[10] *haec ratio redderetur.*

Law which he had received from the lips of Jeremiah the Prophet, and that the king's chief men commanded both Baruch himself, who had received the book, and Jeremiah, through whom God had spoken, to escape and lie hid? Jeremiah dictated, Baruch surrendered—both fled. The book was brought to Joachim the king. Now the king, in consequence of the coldness of the season, had a brazier[1] burning before him—so, as he was not pleased to hear the book recited by Judin the Scribe, he at once tore it up into small fragments[2] and consigned it to the flames. And God was wroth neither with Jeremiah who fled, nor with Baruch who fled with him and surrendered the book. For if God had been wroth with them, He would have spoken to some other Prophet. He did not speak to any other, but to Jeremiah himself, for thus do we read:

> 'The Word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, after the King burned the chapter of the book[3] and the words, which Baruch wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah. God said to Jeremiah: "Take to thyself another paper and write all thy words, which were formerly written in the book, that was burned by Joachim, king of Judah."'[4]

So we see that neither was God wroth, nor did the book which had been burned perish, nor was Baruch punished, nor was Jeremiah disowned by God.[5] From this it is clear that something, which no punishment ever followed, was at no time a serious fault.[6] If your fathers had alleged these examples, who could have rejected them from communion? So when God saw that the Tables of the Law had been broken by Moses, and that the Ark had been abandoned to its foes, and that the book of the Law, after it had been given up by Baruch, was both cut up and burned, He showed His Providence and promised

[1] *arulam ardentem.*
[2] *concisum minutatim.* Cf. Jer. xxxvi, 19, 21.
[3] *capitulum libri.* [4] Jer. xxxvi, 27, 28.
[5] *nec Hieremias a Deo contemptus est.* [6] *gravis culpa.*

that He would write the Law henceforward neither on Tables nor in Books, but in the very inward parts of man[1]—that is, on the mind and heart of each believer, even as He had written it in the heart of Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the other Patriarchs, who, without the Law, certainly lived according to the Law.[2] This is proved by the blessed Apostle Paul, when he says :

'Written not with ink, but by the Spirit of the Living God, not on Tables of Stone, but on the fleshy tablets of the heart.'[3]

After the Law had been broken by Moses, and abandoned by the children of Israel to their enemies, and torn up and burned (when offered by Baruch to Joachim the king)—before the Christian times in which later on God would write in a better way—God pointed out a law through the Prophet, when He said :

'For this is My Covenant, which I will provide for the house of Israel and for the house of Judah, and after those days, saith the Lord, I will give My Laws and will write them in their heart and in their minds.'[4]

This He promised long ago and has last of all fulfilled in Christian times. Therefore the Book is now in the second place ; in the second place are the parchments.[5] If God wrote the Law there, where it could not be betrayed —so that your fathers, who had already believed in the Trinity, although they gave up the books, gave up neither their own hearts nor minds, in which God, according to His Promise, had already written His Law—on what ground, my brother Parmenian, have you said that the Law was completely burned by the Betrayers ? Behold, neither has it been completely burned, nor has it been wholly taken away, so long as it both remains in the

[1] *in ipso interiori homine.* [2] *legitime sine lege.*
[3] 2 Cor. iii, 3. [4] Jer. xxxi, 33. (Cf. Heb. x, 16.)
[5] *secundo loco est charta, secundo loco membranae.*

hearts of the Faithful, and thousands of books are everywhere read aloud.[1] From these considerations it is evident that you have, though in ignorance, taken on you to accuse your fathers in vain. If, therefore, it would have been impossible to repel even your fathers from communion, had they at the time of Unity brought forward so many examples which might have been reasonably alleged, how much more impossible is it to reject you, who are certainly not Betrayers, but the sons of Betrayers; since a distinction has to be made between both the persons and the names of fathers and sons, and where the sin has not been shared, there the same judgement cannot be passed?

Although if they had been brought into unity,[2] and had come to the Catholic Church of their own accord etc.[3]

[1] *librorum milia ubique recitantur.*

[2] *quamquam et si illorum unitas fieret, et si ad Ecclesiam Catholicam sponte venissent,* etc. Casaubon suggests that it should be '*etsi* illorum unitas fieret,' and that the *si* in next clause ought to be omitted. If this emendation can be adopted, the translation will be much easier.

[3] (See page 276, line 22, for continuation.)

B (see p. 279, line 3).

Nor would he have visited upon the fathers any offences perchance committed by the sons. Since, therefore, the Law was renewed in the times of Moses without any man being punished, and the Ark of the Covenant was freely restored by the enemy, and at God's command a second book was written by Jeremiah,[1] why is it thought that your fathers alone committed a deadly[2] sin, when they did something, on account of which, in so many instances, no one was condemned?

For if the Law was given for this purpose, that men should be taught, not that the Law itself should be as it were worshipped in the place of God, then, after your fathers' sin, though individuals[3] lost their volumes[4] under the pressure of fear, yet the mass of the Faithful[5] suffered no loss. For the Law, which had been necessary,[6] still has its force[7] amongst the teachers of the people and the worshippers of God. The libraries are filled with books. Nothing is wanting to the Church. In different places[8] the divine praises are everywhere proclaimed. The mouths of the lectors keep not silence. The hands of all are full of volumes[9] [of Scripture]. Nothing is lacking to the people who wish to be taught—although the law would not seem to have been written more for the sake of teaching, than for that of the judgement to

[1] Cf. Ex. xxxiv, 28; 1 Kings vi, 2 seq.; Jer. xxxvi, 27 seq.

[2] *capitale.*

[3] *unusquisque eorum.*

[4] *codices suos. Codices*, according to the original meaning of the word in this connection, were vellum books, which in the course of time had taken the place of rolls.

[5] *turba credentium.*

[6] *quae necessaria fuerat.*

[7] *valet.*

[8] *per loca singula.*

[9] *manus omnium codicibus plenae sunt.*

come, in order that the sinner may know what may befall him, should he not live rightly. Thus has it been written, and thus do we read, that

'the Law has not been given for the just,'

because

'every just man is himself a law unto himself.'[1]

And in another place the blessed Apostle Paul also says that the Law does not make men just, but itself loves justice.[2] It is results which are always looked for in all those things that produce results.[3] The Law, which produces results, is not needed,[4] when the result is obtained in a quicker way.[5] It was not said to Abraham: 'Believe,' but he believed of his own accord[6]—so in him the result of the Law was made complete without the Law. We do not read:

'Abraham heard the Law and believed,'

but we do read:

'Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for justice.'[7]

And in the earliest times the Patriarch Noah did nothing by which he might become just, yet he as a just man was chosen to build the Ark, in which during the Deluge[8] he might navigate the waters with success. It were a long task to go through all the cases individually of all who, without the Law, were found to be just.

[1] 2 Tim. i, 9 (cf. Rom. ii, 14).
[2] Cf. Rom. iii, 10; Gal. ii, 16.
[3] *semper in omnibus rebus efficientibus effecta quaeruntur.*
[4] *vacat.*
[5] *per compendium paratum est, quod efficitur* (paratum est = comparatum est).
[6] *ultro.*
[7] Gen. xv, 6 (cf. Rom. iv, 3; Gal. iii, 6; James ii, 23).
[8] Cf. Gen. vi.

If these things had been pleaded by your fathers, who would then have rejected them from his communion? Again, [what would have happened] if they had asserted that what the Apostle says of those who are outside the Law[1] ought not to be passed over in silence?

'the nations, that know not the Law, do the things that belong to the Law, for they have the Law written in their hearts.'[2]

For many are known to have sinned with the Law,[3] and many to have lived well without the Law. The Law and Man are two things, but they cannot be on an equality,[4] for Man was not made for the Law, but the Law was given for the sake of men. I do not see that injury has anywhere been done to God, so long as the source[5] of the Law remains with Him. After the Scripture has been given up—so it is said—by your fathers, it wants for nothing, all the members of the Law are sound—are safe, and are read aloud. There is, for those who desire to teach and to be taught, nothing less than there was of the Law. Was it then necessary for man to be slain rather than that any Scripture should be given up? Again, men have not been slain, yet all the Scriptures are here without diminution. The Law and God are not one and the same thing. If they had had to die for God, who can both raise up the dead and give reward, [well and good]; but a book that has not been surrendered cannot do even the second of these two things.[6]

Therefore, necessity shackles [a man's] own strength of will.[7] We often see that carelessness is as disastrous

[1] *extralegalibus.* [2] Cf. Rom. ii, 14. [3] *in lege.*

[4] *Lex et Homo duae res sunt, sed pares esse non possunt.*

[5] *origo.*

[6] *liber non traditus de duobus his nec alterum potest.* It seems impossible to imagine that this trivial special pleading should be the work of St. Optatus.

[7] *impedit igitur necessitas vires suas.* This is the reading of the MSS. We understand *homini.* Casaubon suggests *impendit.*

as necessity. For if the parchments or the books, in which the canonical [1] Scripture is contained, must be kept totally unimpaired, why are not some careless people condemned? There is no wide gulf between giving up [2] and placing in a bad situation, or treating badly. One man has placed the book in a house, which has been burned down in a fire. Let him be condemned, who carelessly placed the book in that house, if another is to be condemned who through fear gave up the book that he knew would be demanded of him. Let them also be condemned, who placed neglected parchments, or books, where they might be gnawed by little household animals [3] (that is by mice) in such a way that they could not be read. Let him be condemned, as well, who has placed them in a part of the house, where, in consequence of too great abundance of rain, water has dropped through the eaves from the roof, so that all the writing has been washed away by the wet, and can no longer be read. Let those too be condemned, who have been rash enough to entrust themselves, together with the books of the Law, to the hungry waves of the sea, and in their eagerness to save their lives, when in the water, have let the Scriptures slip from their hands. Accordingly if the Scripture be the same[4] always, and, if he who has not been able to save it, is guilty—then, one has given it up to the waves, another has abandoned it to rodents,[5] another has carelessly allowed it to be spoiled by the dropping water, and yet another, terrified by the fear of death, has, as man, given it to man. If all have done the same thing,[6] why is one chosen out to be condemned—and this, even though the fault of the Betrayer is lighter than is that of him who has been careless? He who placed it in the way of mice, or left it under the dropping water, with his will was careless, whilst he who lost it in the river, sinned through rashness. He who through the fear of death gave anything up, gave it as a

[1] *legitima.* [2] *tradere,* [3] *domesticae bestiolae:*
[4] *una.* [5] *rosoribus bestiis,* [6] *unum.*

man to a man. It was whole whilst with the giver, it remained whole in the hands of the receiver. If he who received it, gave it up to the flames, this is the sin of the one who burned it, not of him who surrendered it. If these things had been urged by your fathers, how could we have rejected them from our communion? Or if again they had thought well to refer to the times of King Antiochus,[1] when all the Jews were compelled to surrender their Books to be burned, and the whole of the Scripture was given up so completely that not a letter[2] remained in any one book? Not one of the Jews was then condemned, nor was any sentence pronounced against any Jew either by God or by some angel, because the sin was his who commanded and threatened, not the people's who surrendered with fearfulness and sorrow. And in order that this Antiochus should do no injury to His people in these early days,[3] God immediately provided for one man Esdras,[4] who was called a Reader at the time, to dictate the whole as it had been before, to the minutest point.[5] In this way the tyrant Antiochus was not able to enjoy the fruit of his wickedness,[6] since (with the exception of the Seven Brothers and one old man who refused to eat swine's flesh)[7] he killed no Jew, and yet the Law could not be destroyed.[8] In the same way your fathers too in their day were not killed, and yet all the books of the Law of the Lord are read aloud everywhere. If, as I have urged above, your fathers had pointed out these things, who would not have received them into his communion without fear,[9] since, as has been said, their sin was a sin of necessity, not of the will[10]?

Your fathers, who are proved, etc.[11]

[1] Cf. 1 Maccab. i, 59.
[2] *apex*. Literally a dot or accent or point.
[3] *primitivo populo*.
[4] Cf. 1 Esdr. vii.
[5] *ad apicem*.
[6] *malignitatis suae*.
[7] Cf. 2 Maccab. vii, 13.
[8] *lex perire non potuit*.
[9] *intrepide*.
[10] *peccaverat necessitas, non voluntas*.
[11] (For continuation see p. 279, line 4.)

C (see p. 279, l. 16).

. . . for if one who has sinned, as did your ancestors, comes to the Church to plead the necessity of his case, first of all let him be received, and then sheltered [1] in the kindly bosom of Mother Church.

Nor ought any man, etc.[2]

[1] *sustinendus.*
[2] (For continuation see p. 279, line 17.)

For three other probably spurious passages see p. 283, l. 1–4; p. 284, l. 2–5; p. 287, l. 21–22.

## A HUNDRED NOTEWORTHY SAYINGS OF ST. OPTATUS

THESE extracts from the text of St. Optatus have, for the most part, been chosen as noteworthy in consequence of their statement of Doctrine ; some, however, have been selected in consequence of their ethical value, e.g. Nos. 80, 81, 92, 93. The page references are to my English translation and will give the context of each extract.

### I. *The Virginity of Mary*

(1) Quae Virgo iterum peperit ? (III, 11, p. 171, l. 9, 10).

### II. *St. Peter, the Cathedra Petri and the Keys*

(2) Ut haeretici omnes neque claves habeant, quas solus Petrus accepit (I, 10, p. 19, line 4).

(3) Nec Caecilianus recessit a Cathedra Petri, vel Cypriani, sed Maiorinus (I, 10, p. 20, l. 22). Cf. Cathedra Petri, quam nescio si vel oculis novit [Macrobius] (II, 4, p. 70, l. 4).

(4) Bene revocasti claves ad Petrum (I, 12, p. 24, l. 19).

(5) Miltiadis sententia, qua iudicium clausum est (I, 24, p. 47, l. 5–7).

(6) Negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma, Petro primo Cathedram episcopalem esse conlatam, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum Caput Petrus, in qua una Cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur, ne ceteri Apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent, ut iam schismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem Cathedram alteram conlocaret (II, 2, p. 66, l. 7—p. 67, l. 5). (Cf. 38.)

(7) Cathedram unicam, quae est prima de dotibus, sedit prior Petrus, cui successit Linus etc. (II, 2, p. 68, l. 1).

(8) Cum quo Siricio [S. Petri successore] totus orbis

commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat (II, 3, p. 69, l. 25).

(9) Inferi portas suas habere noscuntur, contra quas portas claves salutares accepisse legimus Petrum, principem scilicet nostrum (II, 4, p. 73, l. 4).

(10) Unde est ergo quod claves regni coelorum vobis usurpare contenditis, qui contra Cathedram Petri vestris praesumptionibus et audaci sacrilegio militatis? (II, 5, p. 73, l. 10–12). (Cf. 50.)

(11) De dotibus Cathedra est prima, quam probavimus per Petrum nostram esse, quae ducit ad se Angelum (II, 6, p. 78, l. 12, 13).

(12) Probatum est per Cathedram Petri, quae nostra est, per ipsam et caeteras dotes apud nos esse (II, 9, p. 86, l. 6).

(13) Huius sanctae Ecclesiae est constituta Persona (II. 9, p. 86, l. 19).

(14) Lectio de persona beatissimi Petri, ex qua forma unitatis retinendae vel faciendae descripta recitatur (VII, 3, p. 283, l. 14).

(15) Bono unitatis beatus Petrus et praeferri Apostolis omnibus meruit et claves regni coelorum, communicandas ceteris, solus accepit (VII, 3, p. 284, l. 11).

(16) Stant tot innocentes, et peccator accipit claves, ut unitatis negotium formaretur (VII, 3, p. 288, l. 29–p. 289, l. 2).

(17) Provisum est, ut peccator aperiret innocentibus, ne innocentes clauderent contra peccatores (VII, 3, p. 289, l. 3-4).

(18) Cathedram Petri et claves a Christo concessas, ubi est nostra societas, poteris adprobare mendacium? (VII, 5, p. 294, l. 14–17.)
(Cf. 61.)

### III. *The Church*

(19) Ignoras et quae sit Sancta Ecclesia, et sic omnia miscuisti (I, 10, p. 23, l. 1–3).

(20) Sic fit hominum Pater Deus, sancta sic fit Mater Ecclesia (II, 10, p. 89, l. 1–2).

(21) Quattuor genera capitum in Ecclesia episcoporum, presbyterorum, diaconorum et fidelium (II, 24, p. 112, l. 1–3).

(22) Est spiritalis Sion Ecclesia, in qua a Deo Patre constitutus est Rex Christus, quae est in toto orbe terrarum, in quo est una Ecclesia Catholica (III, 2, p. 127, l. 26–28).

(23) Non enim Respublica est in Ecclesia, sed Ecclesia in Republica (III, 3, p. 132, l. 13, 14).

(24) Ecclesia Catholica omnes filios Pacis gremio et sinu suo complectitur (III, 10, p. 166, l. 14, 15).

## IV. *The Unity of the Church*

(25) Deinde mihi dicendum est quae, vel ubi sit una Ecclesia; quae est, quia praeter unam altera non est (I, 7, p. 14, l. 8–11).

(26) Christus, qui est Sponsus unius Ecclesiae, cum unam laudat ceteras damnat, quia praeter unam, quae est vera Catholica, ceterae apud haereticos putantur esse, sed non sunt (I, 10, p. 18, l. 9–12).

(27) Iamdudum duas Ecclesias conparare voluisti . . . certe una est, quae ex voce Christi meruit indicari, qui ait: 'Una est Columba Mea, una est Sponsa Mea' (II, 13, p. 92, l. 10–18).

(28) Aestimo vos non negare unitatem summum bonum esse (III, 4, p. 149, l. 11, 12). (Cf. 43.)

(29) Domus Dei una est . . . quia non est alter Deus, qui alteram domum inhabitet (III, 10, p. 165, l. 11–p. 166, l. 2).

(Cf. 22, 32, 33, 34, 35, 40, 46, 85.)

## V. *The Church Catholic*

(30) Venerunt ut pronunciarent ubi esset Catholica . . . Novissima sententia eorundem Episcoporum Eunomii et Olimpii talis legitur, ut dicerent *illam esse Catholicam quae esset in toto orbe terrarum diffusa* (I, 26, p. 50, l. 11, 12).

(31) Probavimus eam esse Ecclesiam Catholicam, quae

est in toto orbe terrarum diffusa (II, 2, p. 64, l. 11, 12; and II, 9, p. 86, l. 19–p. 87, l. 1).

(32) Offerre Deo vos dicitis pro una Ecclesia, quae sit in toto orbe terrarum diffusa (II, 12, p. 90, l. 17, 18).

(33) Gaudet totus orbis de Unitate Catholica (III, 9, p. 161, l. 8).

(34) In una Communione esse cum toto orbe terrarum, numquid poteris adprobare mendacium? (VII, 5, p. 294, l. 10–12).

(Cf. 22, 38, 52.)

VI. *The Holiness of the Church*

(35) Ecclesia una est cuius sanctitas de Sacramentis colligitur, non de superbia personarum ponderatur (II, 1, p. 57, l. 9–p. 58, l. 1).

VII. *The Catholic Church anterior to every Schism*

(36) Ut Moyses prior est, sic et Catholica prior est (VII, 5, p. 295, l. 9). (Cf. 50.)

VIII. *The Root*

(37) [Scismatici] deserta matre Catholica, impii filii dum foras exeunt, et se separant (ut vos fecistis) a radice Matris Ecclesiae (I, 11, p. 23, l. 10–14).

(38) Videndum est quis in radice cum toto orbe manserit, quis foras exierit, quis Cathedram sederit alteram, quae ante non fuerat (I, 15, p. 30, l. 19, 20).

(39) Propter nos qui intus habitamus, et nunquam de radice recessimus (III, 7, p. 155, l. 2–4).

(40) De una radice venientes ab invicem divisi sunt rami (III, 9, p. 161, l. 25, 26).

(Cf. 52.)

IX. *Heretics*

(41) Haeretici . . . de se nasci voluerunt (I, 12, p. 24, l. 1–6).

(42) Ecclesia apud omnes haereticos et scismaticos esse non potest (II, 1, p. 58, l. 3).

## X. *The Evil of Schism*

(43) Scisma summum malum esse et vos negare minime poteritis (I, 21, p. 39, l. 13–15). (Cf. 28.)

(44) Factio, quae mater est scismatis (II, 4, p. 71, l. 18).

(45) Intellegite vos esse filios impios, vos esse ramos fractos ab arbore, vos rivum concisum a fonte (II, 9, p. 85, l. 5, 6).

(46) Hoc ipsum mendacii pars est, unam [Ecclesiam] te vocare, de qua feceris duas (II, 12, p. 90, l. 18—p. 91, l. 2).

(47) Quid si unicuique vestrum dicat Deus: 'Quid offers pro tota, qui non es in tota?' (II, 12, p. 91, l. 5–7).

(48) Pars vestra quasi-Ecclesia est, sed Catholica non est (III, 10, p. 167, l. 6, 7).

(49) Revera sufficiebat sibi Ecclesia Catholica, . . . sed Deo vestra separatio non placebat (VII, 1, p. 275, l. 15–p. 276, l. 3).

(50) Iamnes et Mambres secundo loco sunt, qui contra Moysen et veritatem militare voluerunt. Antecesserat Moyses. Ut Iamnes et Mambres repugnantes obstiterunt, sic et vos rebelles contra veram Catholicam militatis (VII, 5, p. 295, l. 4–12). (Cf. 10.)

## XI. *The Donatist Schism*

(51) Scisma igitur illo tempore confusa mulieris iracundia peperit, ambitus nutrivit, avaritia roboravit (I, 19, p. 34, l. 1–4).

## XII. *The Donatist Perversion of History and of Facts*

(52) Mutans personas et transferens merita clausisti oculos, ne parentes tuos reos agnosceres, . . . Omnia igitur, quae a te in traditores et scismaticos dici potuerunt, vestra sunt, nam nostra non sunt, qui et in radice manemus, et in toto orbe terrarum cum omnibus sumus (I, 28, p. 55, l. 3–p. 56, l. 16).

(53) Legisti quidem, sed, ut res se habent, intellegere noluisti, studio criminandi ad convicium Catholicorum cuncta conponens, multum ad arbitrium tuum declinare conatus es (IV, 9, p. 199, l. 13–18).

(54) Quid est ergo quod nomina et nobis et vobis mutare voluistis ? (VII, 5, p. 295, l. 12–14).

## XIII. *Baptism*

(55) Baptisma Christianorum, Trinitate confectum, confert gratiam ; si repetatur, facit vitae iacturam (V, 1, p. 206, l. 7–9).

(56) Bene laudasti Baptisma. Quis enim Fidelium nesciat singulare Baptisma virtutum esse vitam, criminum mortem, nativitatem immortalem, coelestis regni conparationem, innocentiae portum, peccatorum naufragium ? (V, 1, p. 208, l. 12–17).

(57) Si datis alterum Baptisma, date et alteram Fidem ; si datis alteram Fidem, date et alterum Christum ; si datis alterum Christum, date et alterum Deum (V, 3, p. 216, l. 1–4).

(58) Agnoscite quia non lavat homo, sed Deus . . . Sordes enim et maculas mentis lavare non potest nisi Deus, qui eiusdem fabricator est mentis (V, 4, p. 221, l. 12–20).

(59) Aderit profecto ille dies, ut caelestes nuptiae incipiant celebrari ; illic qui Baptisma singulare servaverint, securi discumbent (V, 10, p. 243, l. 17–20).

## XIV. *The Sacrifice of the Eucharist*

(60) Erat altare loco suo, in quo pacifici Episcopi retro temporis obtulerant (I, 19, p. 36, l. 12–p. 37, l. 2).

(61) Ecce praesentes sunt ibi [Romae] duorum Memoriae Apostolorum. Dicite si ad has ingredi potuit, aut obtulit illic, ubi Sanctorum Memorias esse constat (II, 4, p. 71, l. 1–4).

(62) Quo cotidie a vobis sacrificia condiuntur (II, 12, p. 90, l. 13–15).

(63) Quid iniquius quam altaria frangere? (II, 21, p. 108, l. 9–10).

(64) Vinum a peccatoribus operariis et calcatur et premitur, et sic inde Deo sacrificium offertur (II, 4, p. 149, l. 15–17).

(65) Dicebatur enim, illo tempore venturos Paulum et Macarium, qui interessent sacrificio, ut cum altaria solemniter aptarentur, proferrent illi imaginem, quam primo in altare ponerent, et sic sacrificium offerretur (III, 12, p. 173, l. 11–16).

(66) Cum viderent divinis sacrificiis nec mutatum quidquam, nec additum nec ablatum (III, 12, p. 174, l. 9–11).

(67) In quibus ante nos per longa temporum spatia obtulistis (VI, 1, p. 248, l. 10–11).

(68) Macarius nec manum alicui imposuit, nec sacrificium obtulit (VII, 6, p. 176, l. 12).

(Cf. 32, 47.)

## XV. *The Real Presence*

(69) Altaria, in quibus et vota populi et Membra Christi portata sunt (VI, 1, p. 246, l. 6, 8).

(70) Quid est altare nisi sedes et Corporis et Sanguinis Christi? (VI, 1, p. 247, l. 4, 5).

(71) Quid vos offenderat Christus, cuius illis per certa momenta Corpus et Sanguis habitabat? (VI, 1, p. 248, l. 5, 7).

(72) Illic Corpus Christi habitabat (VI, 1, p. 248, l. 12, 13).

(73) Iudaeos estis imitati; illi iniecerunt manus Christo in cruce, a vobis percussus est in Altari (VI, 1, p. 248, l. 15–17).

(74) Fregistis calices, Christi Sanguinis portatores (VI, 2, p. 252, l. 4, 5).

## XVI. *Chrism*

(75) Oleum nominant—illum scilicet liquorem, qui ex Nomine Christi conditur, quod Chrisma, postquam conditum est, nominatur (VII, 4, p. 289, l. 17—p. 290, l. 1).

(76) Oleum, antequam a nobis conficiatur, tale est quale et natum est; confectum suavitatem ex nomine Christi accipere potest (VII, 4, p. 291, l. 11–14).

(77) Chrisma sedem Spiritui Sancto parat ut invitatus illic libenter habitare dignetur (VII, 4, p. 292, l. 8–12).

## XVII. *Varia*

(78) Cunctos nos Christianos Omnipotenti Deo una Fides commendat (I, 1, p. 1, l. 1–p. 2, l. 2).

(79) Cum dotes ad sponsam, non sponsa ad dotes pertineat (II, 10, p. 89, l. 19, 20).

(80) Meliora inventa sunt peccata cum humilitate, quam innocentia cum superbia (II, 20, p. 105, l. 19, 20).

(81) Frustra se Christianum aut Dei sacerdotem profitetur, qui Lenitatem Dei non curat imitari (II, 25, p. 116, l. 16, 17).

(82) Quae maior infelicitas, quam Dei sacerdotes vivere, nec esse quod fuerant? (II, 25, p. 117, l. 24, 26).

(83) Non quaerebat aliud, quod humana semper exigit consuetudo de pluviis, de pace, de proventu anni aliquid interrogare; sed illius ad singulos quosque venientes haec erant verba: 'Quid apud vos agitur de parte Mea?' (III, 3, p. 138, l. 15–19).

(84) Si hominum litigant mentes, non litigant Sacramenta (III, 9, p. 162, l. 16, 17).

(85) Quis Gabriel iterum ad alteram Mariam locutus est? (III, 11, p. 171, l. 8, 9).

(86) Possessio Dei est turba Fidelium (IV, 6, p. 192, l. 19).

(87) In Deo perennis Maiestas exundat (IV, 9, p. 199, l. 27).

(88) Vivus, cuius est testamentum, in coelo est, ergo voluntas Eius, velut in testamento, sic in Evangelio requiratur (V, 3, p. 212, l. 11–13).

(89) Cum ergo videatis *Sacramenta per se esse sancta, non per homines*, quid est, quod vobis tantum vindicatis? (V, 4, p. 220, l. 1, 2).

(90) Intellegite vos sacramentorum ministros, vel sero, operarios esse non dominos (V, 7, p. 233, l. 13, 14).

(91) O Tunica semper una et immutabilis! quae decenter vestiat et omnes aetates et formas, nec in infantibus rugatur, nec in iuvenibus tenditur, nec in feminis immutatur (V, 10, p. 243, l. 13–16).

(92) Suspicio non est idoneum crimen (VI, 3, p. 254, l. 4, 5).

(93) Servate vobis suspiciones vestras (VI, 3, p. 254, l. 8).

(94) Stabularius ille Paulus Apostolus (VI, 4, p. 257, l. 12).

(95) Haec sunt verba Consilii, nec ulla sunt Praecepta coniuncta (VI, 4, p. 258, l. 14).

(96) In Ecclesia non est similis turba animarum (VII, 2, p. 281, l. 3).

(97) Iussit Christus in agro Suo per totam orbem terrarum, in quo est una Ecclesia, et Sua semina crescere et aliena (VII, 2, p. 282, l. 1–5).

(98) Tractandi, quod est Episcoporum (VII, 6, p. 176, l. 18).

(99) Omnis tractatus in Ecclesia a Nomine Dei incipitur et eiusdem Nomine Dei terminatur (VII, 6, p. 176, l. 25, 26).

(100) Scriptum est ante cognitam caussam neminem esse damnandum (VII, 7, p. 178, l. 4).

# PREFACE TO THE APPENDIX

St. Optatus makes several references to the documents which he tells us that he was appending to his work, in order fully to establish the accuracy of his statements. For example, with regard to the Council at Cirta, which was the beginning of all the evil subsequently to be known as Donatism, he appeals to the evidence afforded by the writings of Nundinarius the Deacon, and to the Acts of the Council, which—so he says—

> 'dubitantibus proferre poterimus, harum namque plenitudinem rerum in novissima parte istorum libellorum ad implendam fidem adiunximus' (i, 14).

In the same way he states (i, 20) that he is appending the letter, in which the Bishops who were responsible for the consecration of Majorinus brought their charges against Caecilian. Again, with regard to the decrees of Eunomius and Olimpius he is able to write (i, 26):

> 'De iis rebus habemus volumina actorum, quod, si quis voluerit, in novissimis partibus legat.'

These decrees have been lost. But we have still extant (in their entirety or in part) most of the documents which were placed in his Appendix by St. Optatus.

The Colbertine MS. (C) has alone preserved for us any part of this Appendix. Moreover we possess this MS. in a very incomplete state. It commences only with the middle of the Sixth Book, and at the end of the Seventh we read :

'Expliciunt Sancti Optati Episcopi Libri Numero VII vel Gesta Purgationis Caeciliani Episcopi et Felicis Ordinatoris Eiusdem. necnon Epistola Constantini Imperatoris. *Amen.*'

But unfortunately there are many pages wanting between the *Gesta Purgationis Caeciliani* and the *Gesta Purgationis Felicis*—so that Duchesne writes that at least as much of the *Gesta Purgationis Caeciliani* has been lost as yet remains, perhaps double or treble or possibly even more.[1] With regard to the *Gesta Purgationis Felicis* comparatively little is missing, though the account of the inquiry before the Pro-Consul Aelianus starts somewhere in the middle.[2]

Duchesne has carefully reconstructed the Appendix of St. Optatus,[3] and shown that it probably contained the following documents :

I *Acta Purgationis Caeciliani*

(1) Gesta apud Zenophilum.
(2) Acts of Cirta.
(3) Synodal letter of Donatist Council at Carthage against Caecilian (lost).
(4) Letter of Pro-Consul Anulinus to Constantine.

[1] *Le dossier du Donatisme*, p. 9.

[2] The famous scholar Stephen Baluze published (in 1680) the *Gesta apud Zenophilum* and *Acta Purgationis Felicis* in his *Miscellanea* (Lib. II).

[3] *Le dossier du Donatisme*, p. 42.

(5) Supplication of Donatists (in Optatus i, 22).
(6) Letter of Constantine to Miltiades.
(7) Report of Anulinus to Constantine (lost).
(8) Acts of Roman Council (nearly all lost : a fragment in Opt. i, 23, 24).
(9) Letter of Constantine to Eumelius (lost).
(10) Proceedings of Eunomius and Olimpius in Africa (lost).

II *Acta Purgationis Felicis*

(11) Letter of Constantine to Aelius (or Aelianus ?) (lost).
(12) Letter of Constantine to Probianus.
(13) Acta Purgationis Felicis (the beginning lost).

III *Epistola[e] Constantini Imperatoris*

Probably, however, the collection of Optatus did not contain the letter of the Council of Arles (though it is found in C), since we find no reference to it in his work.

Of these documents, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13 have been quoted or analysed by St. Optatus and St. Augustine ; 4 and 12 have been reproduced in their entirety, and 9 in part, by St. Augustine only ; 10 was known to St. Optatus only. All these documents, with the exception of 1 and 10, were put in and read at the Conference at Carthage in 411.

I give, in the first place, a translation of everything that we still find in C.

We have part of the two interesting trials—of Felix of Aptunga (the consecrator of Caecilian) on the one side and of Silvanus (one of the consecrators of Majorinus) on the other. By these documents considerable light is thrown upon several details of Roman

judicial procedure in Africa during the early years of the fourth century. There are also six letters of Constantine; a short document consisting of a joint letter from officials named Petronius and Julianus; and the well-known synodal letter sent by the Council of Arles, at the conclusion of its labours, to Pope Silvester. These letters have been printed in their chronological order. In each case I have thought it well to prefix a short introduction.

With regard to my translation, perhaps I may be permitted to crave the indulgence of my readers. The great Emperor's sentences (as at least they appear in his letters) are of extraordinary length and complexity, with parenthesis heaped upon parenthesis, so that the task of disentangling them in such a way as to make their meaning intelligible in English, without the sacrifice either of grammar or of verbal accuracy, is one of no small difficulty, as anyone who may make the attempt will discover for himself.

Ziwsa is satisfied with printing these ten documents, but I have also translated and printed the others of St. Optatus' original collection which still remain extant. They are:

xi.—(*a*) The Acts of the Council of Cirta (to be found nearly complete in Augustine *con. Crescon.* iii, 30).

xii.—(*b*) Letter of Anulinus to Constantine (of which the text has been preserved in Augustine *Ep.* lxxxviii, 2).

xiii.—(*c*) Letter of Constantine to Miltiades (to be found in Eusebius, *H.E.* x, 5).

xiv.—(*d*) Letter of Constantine to Probianus (entire in Augustine *con. Crescon.* iii, 81).

I give also two official letters (xv, xvi) from

Constantine to the Pro-Consul Anulinus, which have been preserved by Eusebius, and throw considerable light on the Emperor's attitude towards Catholics and Donatists respectively at this time (A.D. 313).

In addition to the documents which Duchesne shows to have been contained in the Appendix of Optatus, the following were quoted either by St. Augustine or by the Donatists at the Conference of Carthage (A.D. 411).

(1) Acts of seizure of Sacred Books at Rome in 303 (lost).

(2) Acts of Donatist Martyrs of Abilina (Migne, *P.L.* viii, 689–703).

(3) Letters of Mensurius and Secundus (lost).

(4) Procès-verbal of the restitution of the Holy Places in Rome to Pope Miltiades by order of the Emperor Maxentius (lost).

(5) The two letters of Constantine preserved by Eusebius (x, 5, 7), which I have printed and numbered xv, xvi.

(6) Three letters of Constantine (lost).

(7) Supplication to Constantine by Donatists, complaining of persecution (lost).

(8) Letter of Constantine to Verinus, May 5, 321 (lost).

# APPENDIX

## I

## ACTA PURGATIONIS FELICIS EPISCOPI AUTUMNITANI

### Introduction

The scene of the events described in this document—of which unfortunately a large part is missing—was Carthage. The date is A.D. 314. It is, therefore, exactly sixteen hundred years since Constantine, fresh from his victory over Maxentius and full of zeal for the welfare of the religion which he had so recently embraced, gave orders for the charge of Betrayal brought so persistently against Felix, Bishop of Aptunga, to be heard publicly on the spot—that is to say in Africa. It was indeed notorious that there was no real ground for this charge. But to the Donatists it was a matter of life and death that the truth of their accusation against the consecrator of Caecilian should be substantiated, or at any rate generally accepted. Otherwise any attempt to justify their schism broke down of itself. When the matter was gone into at Rome under Pope Miltiades, it had been admitted that no accusation was made against Caecilian personally.[1] The whole

[1] 'Illo tempore a tot inimicis nihil in eum [Caecilianum] potuit confingi; sed de ordinatore suo, quod ab illis falso traditor diceretur, meruit infirmari' (Opt. i, 19).

question really concerned Felix. Consequently Caecilian was declared at Rome to be the rightful Bishop of Carthage, and the legates Eunomius and Olimpius promulgated the Roman decree at Carthage itself. Still the Donatists remained obstinate, and represented to Constantine that their case had not been fairly heard, but that the judges had shut themselves up and given their verdict without any regard to the weight of evidence.[1] Thus it came to pass that a certain Alfius Caecilianus [2] was ordered to go before the Proconsul's court at Carthage, there to give an account of a former investigation of this same matter which had been held at the time when he was himself *duovir*. He was told to bring with him the men who had been his secretary and notary respectively. The name of the Proconsul before whom the trial was to be heard was Aelianus. With Aelianus were at least three commissioners or assessors (though their name of *duovirs* seems to us somewhat quaintly out of keeping with this fact), Gallienus, Fuscius and Sisenna.

The case heard at Rome had direct reference to Caecilian. Now, the case of Felix was to be examined anew, without any reference to Caecilian, on its own merits.[3] We shall see that Aelianus required the Acts of the former African trial to be produced and read *in extenso*. Alfius Caecilianus, in consequence of his age, had been excused from going to the Imperial Court and had made a deposition before the *duovir* Aurelius Didymus Speretius. It was shown that the letter upon which the Donatists relied to convict Felix had been interpolated (or rather

[1] Cf. letter of Constantine, p. 385.

[2] For the sake of clearness I have called the Bishop *Caecilian*; the official *Caecilianus*.

[3] 'Sed quia in ipsa caussa iamdudum in Catholica duorum videbantur laborare personae, et ordinati et ordinatoris; postquam ordinatus in Urbe purgatus est, et purgandus adhuc remanserat ordinator' (Opt. i, 27).

added to) by a certain Ingentius. This Ingentius was secretary to one Augentius, who had been fellow-aedile with Caecilianus. After these Acts had been read the counsel Apronianus insisted on questioning Caecilianus, who explained in some detail his dealings with Ingentius.

Ingentius had falsely represented that Felix had told him that he had certain valuable codices in his possession—and that their owner now wanted them back—so would Ingentius obtain a letter from Caecilianus stating that they had been burned when he was *duovir*? Thus Felix would be able to steal the codices! Had Caecilianus given the letter, as requested, it was to have been used as a proof that Felix had been a Betrayer. It was an ingenious plot; but it failed. At first Caecilianus would not write anything. In the end Ingentius induced Augentius to persuade Caecilianus to write a letter of some kind. This letter has been almost wholly lost, but it is clear that from the point of view of Ingentius it was quite unsatisfactory, as it contained nothing which would have been of any value for his purpose. So Ingentius forged the interpolation, which had been read out at the previous trial. Caecilianus swore that this interpolation was a forgery, and indeed it could not possibly be genuine, since it consisted of an addition (after the original conclusion) purporting to relate a conversation with Felix, who was absent from home at the time. It represents him as giving up the Scriptures *privately* to a friendly official. This was meant to explain why there was no public proof available of Felix's fall.

The evidence was all against Ingentius, who had to confess to the forgery, under fear of torture. But he tried to make out that he committed his crime through love for a certain Bishop Maurus, who was charged with simony. It was shown, however, that, notwithstanding his oaths to the contrary, he had been an envoy of the Donatist faction throughout Numidia and Mauritania, so that it became

clear that the calumny had been invented in the interests of party.

Thus was Felix finally and triumphantly vindicated.

The Donatists, who styled themselves 'the Pure,' were conscious of being themselves *Traditores*. It was partly in order to cover up their own guilt that they invented the quite baseless charge against Felix, the consecrator of Caecilian Bishop of Carthage.[1] That charge once formulated, the next step was to argue that all who communicated with Caecilian—'polluted' by Betrayal—were themselves 'polluted,' even though this conclusion might involve the whole Catholic world in apostasy from Christ. All this has been made clear in the pages of St. Optatus.

The document now before us has vivid touches of dramatic interest, where various scenes are described, as they took place, with much actuality. Sometimes, it must be admitted, we cannot well refrain from asking ourselves how far, with regard to details, play is being given to the exercise of the imagination. But as to the central fact of the innocence of Felix there can be no question, nor as to the justice of the verdict which Optatus tells us was delivered in his favour.[2] Whoever else may have behaved discreditably, against Felix of Aptunga there was no evidence.

[1] '. . . ut crimina in silentium mitterent sua, vitam infamare conati sunt alienam' (Opt. i, 20).

[2] 'A supra memorato proconsule haec pars sententiae dicta est: "Felicem religiosum Episcopum liberum esse ab exustione librorum manifestum est, cum nemo in eum aliquid probare poterit . . . Hoc actis continetur quod Felix illis temporibus neque praesens fuerit, neque conscientiam accommodaverit, neque aliquid tale fieri iusserit." Unde pulsa atque extersa infamia, cum ingenti laude de illo iudicio recessit' (Opt. i, 27).

THE ACTS OF THE VINDICATION OF FELIX, BISHOP OF APTUNGA[1] (THE CONSECRATOR OF CAECILIAN, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE) BEFORE AELIANUS, PROCONSUL OF AFRICA, AT CARTHAGE, DURING THE CONSULATE OF VOLUSIANUS AND AUNIANUS.[2]

. . . [3] In the town [4] of Autumna, Gallienus the Duovir said:

'Since, Caecilianus, you are here present, listen to the letter of my lord, the Right Honourable [5] Aelius Paulinus, acting deputy of the Prefect,[6] in which, according to his letter addressed to us, he has deigned to command that you and the secretary whom you employed during the period of your administration, and the notary [7] should make a declaration. But, inasmuch as the notary of that time has departed this life, you will have to bring with you all the Acts of your administration, in compliance with the requirements of the letter of my Lord, and you will have to go with your secretary to Carthage. The Curator is present. In his presence we charge you, what answer do you make to this?'

Caecilianus said:

'As soon as you handed to me the letter of the Right Honourable Aelius Paulinus, acting deputy of the Prefect, I sent immediately to my secretary Miccius to come and bring me the Acts which were set down at that time, and he is still searching for them. For no small space of time has passed since I held the office of Duovir. It was eleven

[1] *Episcopi Aptungitani*, of Aptunga, or Autumna.
[2] Du Pin's heading.
[3] The early part of the MS. is lost.
[4] *in municipio*. *Municipium* is a self-governing township.
[5] *viri spectabilis*. A title, showing the precise rank—equivalent to our Right Honourable.
[6] *agentis vicariam praefecturam*. [7] *tabularium*.

years ago. So, as soon as he has found them, I will obey a command of such high dignity.'

Gallienus the Duovir said :

'It is to your interest to obey the command, for you see that it is sacred.[1]'

Caecilianus said :

'I have due devotion to a command of such great dignity.[2]'

Then when, a little time after, the secretary Miccius had also arrived, Fuscius the Duovir said :

'Have you too, Miccius, heard that you also have to go with Caecilianus to the office of the Right Honourable Deputy, and bring there with you the documents concerning that time ? What have you to say to this ? '

Miccius answered :

'The magistrate, when his year of office was completed, took all his Acts home with him. . . . I am searching to see whether the wax tablet can be found among them.[3]'

And whilst he was searching, Quintus Sisenna the Duovir said :

'He has answered according to what the Court already knows.'

Apronianus said :

'If the magistrate took away all his Acts, whence can we procure the Acts which were then made or put together at a time of so great importance ? '

[1] *iussionem esse sacram*, i.e. the Emperor's.

[2] *devotus sum tanto praecepto.*

[3] The MS. has *si mei in cera possint inveniri inquiro.* This is plainly corrupt. Baluzius suggested *si in eis cera possit.* This emendation is accepted by Ziwsa.

And, when he said this, Aelianus the Proconsul said :

'Both my questions and the answers of the various persons are contained in the Acts.'

Agesilaus said :

'There are besides other letters, necessary for the understanding of this affair. It is of importance that they should be read.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said :

'Read them in the hearing of Caecilianus, that he may know whether he dictated them.'

Agesilaus read aloud[1] :

During the consulate of Volusianus and Annianus, on the nineteenth of August, in a lawsuit before Aurelius Didymus Speretius, priest of mighty Jupiter, duovir of the magnificent colony of the Carthaginians, Maximus said :

'I speak in the name of the seniors of the Christian people of the Catholic Law.[2] The case must be pleaded before the Supreme Emperors against Caecilian and Felix, who strive their utmost to attack the supremacy of that Law.[3] The proofs of the charges against them in this matter are being searched for. When persecution was proclaimed against the Christians, that is to say, when they were required to offer sacrifice, or betray whatever Scriptures they might have, to be burned, Felix, who was then Bishop of Autumna, had given his consent for Scriptures to be given up by the hand of Galatius, that they might be committed to the fire. And at that time Alfius Caecilianus, whom you may observe here present, was a magistrate, and since it was then his duty to see that, in accordance with the proconsular command, all should sacrifice, and that, in accordance with the Imperial law,[4] they should hand over any Scriptures they might possess, I ask him, since

[1] Here begin the Acts of the former trial.

[2] *Catholicae Legis.* Cf. Opt. i, 11 : 'Catholicam facit simplex et verus intellectus in Lege.'

[3] *principatum eiusdem Legis.* [4] *secundum sacram legem.*

he is here [1] and you see he is an old man and cannot go to the Imperial Court, to make his deposition in the Acts as to whether he gave (as is stated in the Acts [2]) a letter in accordance with an agreement which he had already made, and as to whether the statements which he has made in the letter are true—so that the actions and the truthfulness of these persons may be set forth in the trial before the Emperor.'

Speretius the Duovir said to Caecilianus who was present:

'Do you hear what are the depositions in the Acts?'

Alfius Caecilianus said:

'I had gone to Zama with Saturninus to buy linen garments,[3] and when we arrived there, the Christians themselves sent to me in the praetorium to ask "Has the Emperor's ordinance reached you?" I answered "No, but I have already seen copies, and have seen churches destroyed and also Scriptures burnt at Zama and Furni. So if you have any Scriptures, bring them forth, that the Emperor's command may be obeyed." Then they sent to the house of the Bishop Felix to bring out the Scriptures from there, that they might be burnt in accordance with the Emperor's decree. So Galatius went with us to the place where they had been accustomed to celebrate their prayers. We took out the Chair and the letters of salutation,[4] and afterwards [5] all were burnt in accordance with the Emperor's decree. And when we sent to the house of this Bishop Felix the public officials informed us that he was not there. And when, at a later time,[6] Ingentius

[1] The MS. has *secundum sens est*. Deutsch (*Drei Aktenstücke zur Geschichte des Donatismus*. Berlin, 1875) supplies [*quod prae*]-*sens*.

[2] *secundum*. Deutsch supplies *Acta*. Ziwsa accepts these two emendations. Evidently something is lacking.

[3] *propter lineas comparandas*. Possibly it may mean 'to compare the lines of the document.'

[4] *cathedram tulimus et epistolas salutatorias*. It has been thought that these were letters of St. Paul. The point seems rather to be that they were ordinary, not sacred, letters, and as such not of an incriminating character.

[5] *postea*, an emendation for *ostia*.

[6] i.e. many years afterwards.

arrived—the secretary of Augentius, with whom I was aedile—I dictated to that[1] colleague the letter which I wrote to this Bishop Felix.'

Maximus said :

'He is here.[2] Let this letter be shown him, that he may recognise it.'

He answered :

'It is the one.'

Maximus said :

'Since he has recognised his own letter, I shall read it, and ask that it be inserted in the Acts in full.'

And he read it aloud :

'Caecilianus to his father Felix, health! Inasmuch as Ingentius has approached my colleague Augentius his friend, and asked whether, in accordance with the Emperor's command, any Scriptures of your Law were burnt in the year when I was aedile[3] . . . my friend Galatius, a Christian,[4] publicly brought forth letters of salutation from the Basilica. I wish thee good health.

'This[5] is the proof that the Christians and the owner of the praetorium had written to entreat my mercy—that you said "Take the key and take also whatever books you may find upon the Chair and whatever codices there may be upon the stone. But see, I beg you, that the officials do not take away the oil and wheat."[6] And I said to you "Are you unaware that where Scriptures are found, the house itself is pulled down?" And you said "What then are we to do?" And I said to you "Let one of your people take them out into the court where you make your prayers, and let them be placed there. And I will come with the officials and take them away.'

[1] *eidem collegae* (i.e. Ingentius).

[2] i.e. Caecilianus, who had just finished speaking.

[3] Here there is a lacuna. The greater part of the letter is lost.

[4] *ex lege vestra.*

[5] At this point, after the usual conclusion, commences the forgery of Ingentius.

[6] *oleum et triticum.*

And we all went there and took everything away in accordance with the Emperor's command.'

Maximus said :

'Since the reading of his letter, which he has acknowledged that he sent, has been placed upon the Acts, we ask that his words should remain upon the Acts.'

Speretius the Duovir said :

'What you have said has been written down.'[1]

Agesilaus said :

'With regard to the present letter which he has recognised, he says that the last part which has just been read is a forgery.'

Caecilianus said :

'My lord, I dictated up to the point where we find the words "My dearest father, I wish thee good health."'

Apronianus said :

'Always has it been so, that those who have refused to adhere to the Catholic Church, have acted thus treacherously, by terrorising, by acting a pretence, by anti-religious bent.[2] For when Paulinus was Vice-prefect here, a man without official position was suborned to act the part[3] of a courier, that he might go to those who belong to the Catholic unity,[4] and ensnare and terrify them.[5] And now the conspiracy[6] has been discovered. For a lying story was made up against the most holy Bishop Felix, so that it might appear that he had betrayed and burnt the Scriptures. It was in fact Ingentius (since his

[1] Here the reading ceases, and the later trial proceeds.
[2] *per terrorem, per scaenam, per inreligiosam mentem.*
[3] *modum* (= *speciem, formam*). The MS. has *modicum.*
[4] *Catholicae unitatis.*
[5] *eos induceret et terreret.*
[6] *factio* (cf. Optatus ii, 4 : 'factio quae mater sciematis est').

whole line of conduct was opposed to the holiness and religion of Caecilian) who was suborned to come with a letter that purported to be from Felix the Bishop to Caecilianus the Duovir, and pretend to him that he was commissioned by Felix. Let him give us the very words in which this story was concocted.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'Tell us.'

Apronianus said: ['Ingentius spoke in this way to Caecilianus:] "Tell my friend Caecilianus," said Felix to me, "that I received [from somebody] eleven precious divine codices, and, as he is now demanding[1] of me to restore them, say that you[2] burnt them in your year of office, so that I need not return them to him."[3] For this reason Ingentius must be questioned as to the manner in which these designs were manufactured and fabricated, as to how he strove to lead his master to tell lies, that he might bespatter Felix with infamy. Let him tell us by whom he was sent, but if this plot against the good name of Felix, by which he might do injury to the episcopal character[4] of Caecilian from its commencement. . .[5] For there is a certain person[6] who was sent by the other side[7] as ambassador through Mauritania and Numidia.'

[1] *convenit me*, a frequent late use of *convenire*, = 'he is calling upon me to.' *He* is the owner of the codices.

[2] i.e. Caecilianus.

[3] Apronianus is quoting here the actual words in which Ingentius is said to have reported to Caecilianus the actual words supposed to have been used by Felix.

[4] *pudori et initio*. *Pudori* is manifestly corrupt. Possibly the right reading may be *innocentiae*. *Initio* = the source of his episcopate.

[5] There is here a lacuna. Ziwsa suggests *paraverit*, but as this is only a guess, I have left the sentence incomplete.

[6] *quidam*, i.e. Ingentius himself, who had been a Donatist agent (*cursor*).

[7] *ex diversa parte*, i.e. by the Donatists.

In the presence of Ingentius, Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'At whose bidding did you undertake to do these things that are brought against you?'

Ingentius said:

'Where?'

Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'As you pretend not to understand what you are asked, I will speak more plainly. Who sent you to the magistrate Caecilianus?'

Ingentius said:

'No one sent me.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'How was it then that you went to the magistrate Caecilianus?'

Ingentius said:

'When we had arrived and the case of Maurus, a Bishop from Utica, who bought his bishopric,[1] was being tried, Felix, the Bishop of Autumna, came up to the city to preach,[2] and said "Let no one communicate with him, for he is guilty of fraud.[3]" And I, on the other hand, said to him "Let no one communicate with you any more than with him,[4] because you are a Betrayer." I was grieving over the case of Maurus my guest, since I had communicated with him when I was abroad—for I escaped from the persecution. From it[5] I went into the country of Felix himself and took with me three seniors, that

[1] *qui Episcopatum sibi redemit.* [2] *ut tractaret.*
[3] *quia falsum admisit.* *Falsum*=fraud—in this case, simony.
[4] *nec tibi nec illi.* [5] *exinde*, i.e. from the persecution.

they might see whether in truth he had been a Betrayer or not.'

Apronianus said :

' It is not so. He went to Caecilianus. Ask Caecilianus about it.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said to Caecilianus :

' How was it that Ingentius came to you ? '

Caecilianus answered :

' He came to me at home. I was at dinner with the workmen.[1] He came in and stood in the doorway.[2] " Where is Caecilianus ? " said he. I answered " Here." I said to him " What is it ? Is all right ? " " Everything," said he. I answered him " If you are not too proud to dine, come and have dinner." He said to me " I am coming back." He came alone. He began to tell me that he wanted me to look into the matter and inquire whether the Scriptures had been burnt in the year when I was Duovir. I said to him " You annoy me. You are a man who has been suborned.[3] Be off with you. Take yourself away from me." And I spurned him from me.[4] And he came yet a second time together with my colleague with whom I had been aedile.[5] My colleague said to me " Felix, our Bishop, sent this man here that you might give him a letter, because he has received precious codices, and is unwilling to give them back. Write for him that they were burnt in the year when you were Duovir." And I said " Is this the faith of Christians ? " '

Ingentius said :

' My lord, let Augentius also be called, for I too have

[1] *prandebam cum operarios* (accusative for ablative, as not unusual in this kind of Latin) (cf. p. 341, n. 2).

[2] *stetit in ianua.*

[3] *homo immisus es.*

[4] *sprevi illum a me.*

[5] i.e. Augentius.

held honourable office.[1] [If you listen to this story] it will be all over with my honour, and . . .'[2]

Aelianus the Proconsul said to Ingentius:

'You are convicted on another ground.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said to an officer:

'Strip and bind him.'[3]

And when he was made ready, Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'Let him be drawn up.'[4]

And while he was being drawn up on the rack, Aelianus the Proconsul said to Caecilianus:

'Under what circumstances did Ingentius come to you?'

He answered:

'"Our friend Felix," so he spoke, "sent me here that you should write to him, since there is an abandoned man who is the owner of some most precious codices which are in his possession, and he is unwilling to restore them. So —that they may not be claimed back—write that they were burnt." And I said to him "Is this the faith of a Christian?" Then I began to rebuke him. But my colleague said "Write thither to our friend Felix." And so I dictated the letter which lies before you, up to the place that I have pointed out.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'Listen without fear to the reading of your letter. See how far you dictated.'

[1] *et ego honorificus sum* (I too have held public office—*honor*—and so am as worthy to be believed as Caecilianus).

[2] '*et huius latera habemus.*' These words follow in the MS. They seem hopelessly corrupt.

[3] *apta eum.*

[4] *suspendatur* (i.e. on the rack, ready for torture).

Agesilaus read out :

' " . . . I wish you, my dearest father, good health for many years." '

Aelianus the Proconsul said to Caecilianus :

' Did you dictate as far as this ? '

He answered :

' As far as this. The rest is a forgery.'

Agesilaus read aloud [the remainder of the letter] :

' " This is the proof that the Christians and the owner of the praetorium had written to entreat my mercy, and that you had said [1] ' Take the key and take also whatever books you may find upon the Chair and whatever codices there may be upon the stone. But see, I beg you, that the officials do not take away the oil and the wheat.' And I said to you ' Are you unaware that where Scriptures are found the house itself is pulled down ? ' And you said ' What then shall we do ? ' And I said to you ' Let one of your people take them out into the halls where you make your prayers, and let them be placed there. And I will come with the officials [2] and take them away.' And we went thither, and took everything away as we had arranged,[3] and burnt it in accordance with the Emperor's command." '

Maximus said :

' Since there has also been placed upon the Acts the purport of this letter, which he himself said that he had acknowledged and sent, we ask that this should be set down on your Acts.'

[1] I have corrected the text here from the copy of the letter already given (p. 335). The MS. has ' hoc signo quod deprecatorium ad me misisti, nisi ego et tu et cuius est praetorium et dixit,' which is clearly corrupt and, as it stands, untranslatable.

[2] *cum officiales* (*cum* with accusative).

[3] *secundum placitum* = as had been arranged between us.

Speretius said :

' What you have said has been written down.'

Caecilianus answered :

' It is a forgery from that point. It is my letter up to where I said " My dearest father, farewell." '

Aelianus the Proconsul said :

' Who do you say added to the letter ? '

Caecilianus said :

' Ingentius.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said :

' Your statement is set down in the Acts.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said to Ingentius :

' You shall be tortured to prevent your telling lies.'

Ingentius said :

' I have sinned. I *did* add to this letter, through my grief on account of Maurus my guest.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said :

' Constantine Maximus ever Augustus, and Licinius, Caesars, deign to show such favour to Christians as to be unwilling that their discipline should be corrupted ; on the contrary, they are determined that this religion should be observed and respected. Do not, therefore, flatter yourself that, because you tell me that you are a worshipper of God, on this account you cannot be tortured. You shall be tortured, that you may not tell lies—a thing which is thought to be foreign to Christians. So tell the truth frankly, that you may not be tortured.'

Ingentius said :

' I have already confessed without torture.'

Apronianus said:

'Be pleased to ask him by what authority, by what craft, by what madness he went through all the districts of Mauritania and also of Numidia, and by what means he stirred up sedition against the Catholic Church.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'Have you been to the Numidias?'

He answered:

'No, my Lord. Let anyone prove it who can.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'Nor to Mauritania?'

He answered:

'I was there on commercial business.'

Apronianus said:

'In this he lies, my Lord, for it is impossible to travel to Mauritania, excepting through the Numidias. Now he says that he was in Mauritania, but not in Numidia.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said to Ingentius:

'What is your rank?'

Ingentius answered:

'I am a decurion of the Ziquenses.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said to the officer:

'Lower him.'[1]

[1] *submitte illum.* Ingentius had been 'prepared' (stripped and bound) and then hung up on the *equuleus*, ready for the screws to be turned. When Aelianus hears he is a decurion, he has him lowered. We learn from St. Augustine (*con. Cresc.* iii, 70) that Ingentius was prepared for torture, but not actually tortured, because he said that he was a decurion. *Submitte* corresponds to *suspendatur*

When he had been lowered, Aelianus the Proconsul said to Caecilianus :

' You have given false evidence.'

Caecilianus answered :

' Not so, my lord. Command the attendance of him who wrote the letter. He is his friend. He will tell you to what point I dictated the letter.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said :

' Who is it whom you wish to have here ? '

Caecilianus said :

' Augentius, with whom I was aedile. It is only through the evidence of Augentius himself who wrote the letter, that I can prove my case. He can tell you to what point I dictated to him.'

Aelianus the Proconsul said :

' Is it then certain that the letter is a forgery ? '

Caecilianus answered :

' It is certain, my lord. In my blood I do not lie.' [1]

Aelianus the Proconsul said :

' Since you held the office of Duovir in your country we ought to give credence to your words.'

Apronianus said :

' It is no new thing for them to act in this way. They have added what they pleased to the Acts. It is a trick of theirs.'

(supra). Aelianus is for the moment favourable to Ingentius, and turns upon Caecilianus : ' Your evidence was false.' Still, as we shall see immediately, he recognises that, as an ex-duovir, Caecilianus is more to be trusted than Ingentius, who was only a decurion ! Moreover, Ingentius had actually confessed.

[1] *non mentior in sanguine meo.*

Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'Through the evidence of Caecilianus, who tells us that the Acts have been falsified, and many additions made to his letter, the purpose of Ingentius in doing these things has been made clear. So let him be committed to gaol, for we shall require him for stricter examination. Moreover, it is manifest that Felix the holy Bishop has been cleared from the charge of burning the Divine writings, since no one has been able to prove anything against him to show that he gave up or burned the most sacred Scriptures. For through all the evidence, it has been made clear on the interrogatories that no Divine Scriptures were either discovered or corrupted or burnt by him. *It is shown by the Acts that Felix the holy Bishop was neither present when these things were done, nor was privy to them,*[1] *nor did he order anything of the kind.*'[2]

Agesilaus said:

'What does your lordship order to be done with these witnesses, who came to give evidence to your lordship?'

Aelianus the Proconsul said:

'Let them go back to their homes.'

[1] *conscientiam accommodaverit,* lit. 'gave his privity to it' = allowed the thing to be done with his knowledge.

[2] The italicised words are quoted by St. Optatus textually (i, 27). Cf. p. 55.

## APPENDIX—II

## GESTA APUD ZENOPHILUM

### (Introduction.)

It is A.D. 320, six years after the vindication of Felix of Aptunga, and another trial is proceeding. Time has amply brought her revenge. Now the accusation is no longer against the consecrator of Caecilian the Catholic Bishop of Carthage, but against Silvanus the Donatist Bishop of Cirta, the consecrator of Majorinus, who had been intruded into Caecilian's Chair. In this trial it is conclusively proved that Silvanus and his abettors had been guilty not merely of Betrayal—the sin falsely alleged against Felix and Caecilian, as a pretext for abandoning communion with Caecilian—but also of theft and simony under peculiarly disgraceful circumstances.

St. Optatus, in his description of the commencement of the Donatist schism, has mentioned the name of the Deacon Nundinarius, the editor of the Acts of the Bishops who, in the year 303, met at Cirta to elect a successor to the recently deceased Bishop of that city.[1] When the citizens of Cirta heard that Silvanus had been chosen to be their chief Pastor—Silvanus, a man of bad reputation, who was well known to them as a *Traditor* — they cried out '*Traditor est, alius fiat. Purum et integrum civem nostrum volumus.*' The clergy also protested against this election, but Silvanus was supported by a noisy mob of the lowest

[1] Cf. Opt. i, 13, 14.

rabble, and consecrated Bishop by the notorious Secundus of Tigisis. One of the first acts of Silvanus after his consecration was to ordain a certain Victor. This Victor, in order to be made a priest, paid a large sum of money to Silvanus, which Silvanus on his part promptly distributed amongst Secundus and the other Bishops who had taken part in his own consecration. (Such was the character of the shameless men, who were so soon, for their own purposes, to precipitate the Donatist schism by their consecration of Majorinus in opposition to Caecilian.)

Now these facts were well known to Nundinarius the Deacon. It was therefore an evil hour for Silvanus, leading him into much trouble, when, for some reason unknown to us, he violently quarrelled with Nundinarius. Other guilty Donatist Bishops, especially the terrible Purpurius [1] and a certain Fortis, were greatly alarmed when the news of this quarrel reached their ears, and wrote to Silvanus, and to their party in Cirta, that it was imperative that a reconciliation should be effected between Silvanus and Nundinarius. Means must be found to hush the matter up, lest worse things befall them. Evidently it would be too deplorable if it were to be publicly proved that they had been themselves guilty of crimes far more shameful than anything with which they falsely reproached the Catholic Bishops. But it was all to no purpose. Nundinarius was, in the end (though he seems to have wavered for a while), not to be appeased. Catholics called out for a public investigation. It was granted, and followed in due course before Zenophilus.

Throughout the proceedings Nundinarius proved the case against Silvanus with merciless precision. There was first the evidence of an inhabitant of Cirta—a certain Victor, a grammarian. As this Victor tried at first to screen Silvanus, there were read aloud municipal Acts recorded during the persecution when Munatius Felix was

[1] Cf. Opt. i, 13: 'Homicida Purpurius Limatensis' etc.

*Curator.* From these it became clear that Silvanus had indeed been a Betrayer, and Victor had to admit this, though he tried to save himself by denying that he was present when it all happened. Then the compromising and discreditable letters were read, from which it was seen how much Purpurius and Fortis dreaded exposure. No doubt they were afraid that Nundinarius might denounce them, as already he had denounced Silvanus in a *libellus* of accusation, which had been addressed to all the clergy and elders of Cirta, and was read in full before Zenophilus. Furthermore, witnesses were produced who told the old story of the events that took place at the consecration of Silvanus, which proved him to have been guilty of Betrayal and Simony. It was also shown that he and Purpurius, as well as other Donatists, had been guilty of thefts from the Temple of Serapis. Further evidence was given which proved that the Numidian Bishops (now Donatists) had received money from Lucilla, in order that Majorinus might be consecrated rival Bishop of Carthage in opposition to Caecilian, and that they had kept it all for themselves, though part of it at least was intended by its donor for the poor.

Most of these Proceedings are extant, but the judgement is wanting. It is, however, certain that Silvanus was banished by Zenophilus for Betrayal,[1] for robbing the Treasury of vinegar casks, for taking money for Ordination, and for having been himself made Bishop by violence, of all of which crimes he had been proved guilty in the course of these Proceedings.

[1] St. Augustine writes thus of Silvanus (*con. Cresc.* iii, 30): 'Qui cum Traditor fuisset, permanere etiam haereticus voluit, ut falsum honorem in parte Donati haberet, qui habere in Catholica nullum posset tam manifestis Traditionis suae gestis publico iudicio referatis.'

## THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE ZENOPHILUS.

### The Commencement of the Proceedings before Zenophilus, by which it becomes clear that Silvanus, who with others consecrated Majorinus, the Predecessor of Donatus, was a Betrayer.[1]

In the consulship of Constantine Maximus Augustus and Constantine the younger the most noble Caesar, on the thirteenth of December, (Sextus of Thamagudi being the secretary,) [2] after Victor the Grammarian had been brought in and sworn,[3] Nundinarius the deacon also being present, Zenophilus, a most noble man of consular rank,[4] said :

'What is your name ? '

He answered :

'Victor.'

Zenophilus said :

'What is your station in life ? '

Victor said :

'I am a lecturer in the literature of Rome, a Latin grammarian.'

[1] Du Pin's heading.

[2] There is evidently something wanting here in the MS. *scribente* has been suggested. Also *excipiente*.

[3] *inducto et applicito*. Cf. Exod. xxii, 8 : 'si latet fur, dominus domus *applicabitur* ad deos, et iurabit quod non extenderit manum in rem proximi sui.'

[4] *vir clarissimus consularis*. These words are always repeated after *Zenophilus* in the text. We shall omit them henceforth in the translation, as the repetition in English would be merely wearisome.

Zenophilus said:

'What is your rank?'

Victor said:

'My father was a decurion of Cirta. My grandfather was a soldier. He had seen service at court.[1] For our family is of Mauritanian blood.'[2]

Zenophilus said:

'Be mindful of your honour and character, and tell me with simplicity—what was the cause of the dissension amongst Christians?'

Victor said:

'I do not know the origin of the dissension. I am one of the Christian people. However, when I lived at Carthage and the Bishop Secundus[3] had at length arrived there, they are said to have discovered that Caecilian had been wrongfully[4] made a Bishop, by whom I know not; and they set up another in opposition. From that time forward the dissension at Carthage began, but I cannot know its origin fully, for our city always has one church,[5] and if dissension there was, we know nothing about it.'

[1] *in comitatu*. *Comitatus* is the regular name for the Court of the Emperor. There are several instances in the fourth and fifth centuries of Canons of Carthage enacted against Bishops going *ad comitatum*—i.e. to curry favour at Ravenna.

[2] Victor was evidently in the Moorish Guard.

[3] Of Tigisis. St. Augustine often mentions him, speaking of him as Primate of Numidia, and telling us that he presided at the Council of Cirta.

[4] *non recte*.

[5] *quoniam semper civitas nostra unam Ecclesiam habet*. There was at this time only one Bishop at Cirta. But at the time of the first Conference of Carthage there were two Bishops there, Fortunatus sometimes called Fortunatianus (the Catholic) and Petilianus (the Donatist)—both of whose names figure amongst the eighteen elected *Actores*. We find that Petilianus complained that another Catholic

Zenophilus said:

'Are you in communion with Silvanus?'

Victor answered:

'I am.'

Zenophilus said:

'Why then have you passed over that man[1] whose innocence has been cleared[2]?' And added: 'Besides, it is stated that you know something else with the fullest certainty—that Silvanus is a Betrayer. Own to this.'

Victor replied:

'This I know not.'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius the Deacon:

'Victor says that he does not know that Silvanus is a Betrayer.'

Bishop named Delphinus (who was too ill to attend the Conference) was living 'in the middle of his Diocese.' St. Augustine tells us (*Ep.* cxxxix) that this Delphinus had been sent to Numidia by his fellow-Bishops on account of the needs of the Church. At the Conference of Carthage there was a passage of arms between Fortunatus and Petilianus. When the latter heard the name of the former read aloud, he cried out 'Ipse est persecutor Ecclesiae in eadem civitate ubi ego Episcopus sum.' To which Fortunatus was not slow to retort 'In eadem civitate ab haereticis omnia altaria confracta sunt' (*Gesta Coll. Carthag. diei* I, lxv; cxxxviii, cxxxix) —so that there was not always harmony at Cirta.

[1] *intermisso eo.* This has been taken as referring to Caecilian. But these proceedings were not at Carthage, but in Numidia, so that *eo* probably should be understood of Felix of Aptunga.

[2] *cuius innocentia purgata est.* For *purgata* Masson reads *probata* —but wrongly (cf. *Coll. tert. Carthag.* cap. dlxxi: 'Donatistarum prosecutio, qua dicunt praesentem Felicem debuisse *purgari*'; and cap. dlxiv: 'Prosecutio Catholicorum, maioris esse innocentiae documentum, quod absens *purgatus* est Felix'). St. Augus ine also uses *purgare* in this sense (cf. *Ep.* clxii and *Contra Cresconium Grammaticum* iii, lxi).

Nundinarius the deacon said:

'He knows quite well, for[1] he himself gave up the codices.'

Victor answered:

'I had fled from that storm—and if I lie, let me perish. When we suffered the inrush of sudden persecution, we fled to Mount Bellona.[2] I remained there with Mars the deacon. Victor the priest was there also. When this Mars was ordered to give up all the books, he said that he had not got them. Then Victor gave up the names of all the lectors. They came to my house in my absence. The magistrates went in and carried off my codices. When I got back, I found that the codices had been taken away.'

Nundinarius the deacon said:

'But at the public investigation you answered that you gave up the codices. Why deny things that can be proved?'

Zenophilus said to Victor:

'Acknowledge frankly, that you may not be questioned with greater severity.'[3]

Nundinarius the deacon said:

'Let the Acts be read.'

Zenophilus said:

'Let them be read.'

Nundinarius then gave them, and the notary read aloud:

'In the consulate of Diocletian the Eighth, and Maximinian the Seventh, on the nineteenth of May, from the Acts of

[1] *nam*. So Ziwsa. The MS. has *non*. Masson reads *num*.
[2] Near Cirta.
[3] i.e. that you may not be put to the torture.

Munatius Felix the perpetual flamen, the guardian of the colony at Cirta.

'When they came to the house in which the Christians were accustomed to assemble, Felix the flamen and guardian of the state said to Paul the Bishop:

"Bring out the Scriptures of the Law,[1] and anything else that you may have here, as has been commanded, that you may obey the order."

'Paul the Bishop said:

"The lectors have the Scriptures. But we surrender what we have here."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Paul the Bishop:

"Show us the lectors or send to them."

'Paul the Bishop said:

"You all know them."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said:

"We do not know them."

'Paul the Bishop said:

"The public officers know them—that is Edusius and Junius, the notaries."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said:

"Let the matter of the lectors stand over. They will be pointed out by the public officers. Do you surrender what you have."

'In the presence of Paul the Bishop (who remained seated), of Montanus and Victor of Deusatelium, and Memorius priests, Mars and Helius the deacons, Marcuclius, Catullinus, Silvanus and Carosus the subdeacons standing by with Januarius, Meraclus, Fructuosus, Migginis, Saturninus, Victor and the rest of the grave-diggers,[2] Victor of Aufidus made this brief inventory against them.

[1] *Legis* (sc. *Catholicae*). Cf. *Acta Purgationis Felicis*, p. 333.

[2] *fossoribus*. The *fossores* or grave-diggers were recognised Christian officials.

'*Two golden chalices, also six silver chalices, six silver pots,*[1] *a silver chafing vessel,*[2] *seven silver lamps, two torches,*[3] *seven short brass candlesticks with their lamps, also eleven brass candlesticks with their chains, eighty-two women's garments, thirty-eight veils,*[4] *sixteen men's garments, thirteen pair of men's shoes, forty-seven pair of women's shoes, eighteen pattens for the country.*'[5]

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Marcuclius, Silvanus and Carosus the grave-diggers :

"Bring forth whatever you have."

'Silvanus and Carosus said :

"All that was here we have thrown out."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Marcuclius, Silvanus and Carosus :

"Your answer is set down in the Acts."[6]

'After the cupboards in the bookcases had been found to be empty,[7] Silvanus brought forth a silver casket[8] and a silver candlestick, for he said that he had found them behind a jug.[9]

'Victor of Aufidus said to Silvanus :

"Had you not found these things, you were a dead man."[10]

[1] *urceola.* [2] *cucumellum.* [3] *cereofala.* [4] *mafortea.*
[5] *coplas rusticanas.* [6] *responsio vestra actis haeret.*
[7] *posteaquam in bibliothecis inventa sunt armaria inania.* So the MSS. St. Augustine, however, referring to the passage, reads 'Posteaquam apertum est in bibliothecam' (*con. Cresc.* iii, 29) and again 'Posteaquam perventum est ad bibliothecam' (*ibid.* iv, 56). From these two passages Masson made up his reading, accepted by Du Pin, *Posteaquam perventum est in bibliothecam.* But, as Baluzius points out, the old reading may well stand, for *bibliotheca* here probably means *bookcase*. Thus Possidius in his life of St. Augustine (chapter xxxi) writes : 'Una cum *bibliothecis* libros.'
[8] *capitulata.* St. Augustine twice gives us the word 'capitulata' (*Ep.* clxv ; *con. Cresc.* iii. 29) ; but once (*con. Cresc.* iv, 56) for. *capitulatam* he substitutes *capsulam.* *Capsa* is a *box* (e.g. for MS. rolls).
[9] *post orcam.* St. Augustine quoting this passage (*con. Cresc.* iii, 29) reads *arcam.*
[10] St. Augustine mentions this in three places (*Ep.* clxvii ; *contra Cresc.* iii, 29, and iv, 56).

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Silvanus:

"Search more carefully, lest anything else should have been left behind."

'Silvanus said:

"Nothing has been left behind. This is all—what we have thrown out."[1]

'And when the dining-room[2] was opened, there were found in it four casks[3] and six jugs.[4]

'Felix the perpetual flamen and life-guardian of the state said:

"Bring forth whatever Scriptures you have, that we may obey the precepts and commands of the Emperors."

'Catullinus brought forth one very large codex.

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Marcuclius and Silvanus:

"Why have you given us only one codex? Bring forth the Scriptures which you have."

'Catullinus and Marcuclius said:

"We have no more, for we are sub-deacons, but the lectors have the codices."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Marcuclius and Catullinus:

"Show us the lectors."

'Marcuclius and Catullinus said:

"We do not know where they live."

[1] *quod hic fuit, totum hoc eiecimus.* A colloquialism for 'Hoc quod eiecimus totum est.'

[2] *triclinium.* It is interesting to see that there was a dining-room attached to the church.

[3] *dolia.*

[4] *orcae.*

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Catullinus and Marcuclius:

"If you do not know where they are living, tell us their names."

'Catullinus and Marcuclius said:

"We are not Traitors,[1] behold we are here. Order us to be killed."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said:

"Let them be taken into custody."

'And when they came to the house of Eugenius, Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Eugenius:

"Bring forth the Scriptures which you have, that you may obey the decree."

'And he brought forth four codices.

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Silvanus and Carosus:

"Show us the other lectors."

'Silvanus and Carosus said:

"The Bishop has already told you that the notaries Edusius and Junius know them all. Let them point out their houses to you."

'Edusius and Junius said:

"We will point them out to you, my lord."

'And when they came to the house of Felix, the worker in marbles, he brought forth five codices. And when they came to the house of Victorinus, he brought forth eight codices. And when they came to the house of Projectus, he brought forth five large and two small codices.

'And when they came to the house of Victor the Grammarian, Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to him:

[1] *Proditores*, as contrasted with *Traditores*. They said that they might 'betray' (*tradere*) books, but they were no traitors to give up (*prodere*) their fellow-men.

"Bring forth whatever Scriptures you have, that you may obey the decree."

'Victor the Grammarian brought forth two codices, and four *quinions*.[1] Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Victor:

"Bring forth the Scriptures. You have more."

'Victor the Grammarian said:

"If I had more, I would have given them."

'And when they came to the house of Euticius of Caesarea, Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Euticius:

"Bring forth the Scriptures which you have, that you may obey the decree."

'Euticius said:

"I have none."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Euticius:

"Your statement is set down in the Acts."

'And when they came to the house of Coddeo, his wife brought forth six codices.

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state then said:

"Look and see whether you have not got more. Bring them forth."

[1] *quiniones*. *Quinio*, i.e. a gathering of five leaves. Most MSS. are formed of *quaternions*, i.e. of four leaves doubled, the smooth face of one to smooth face of the other, hair face to hair face. Usually the outside is hair face. In *quinions* and *ternions* it was necessary to have them alternately hair and smooth face outside. (The codices *may* have been of papyrus; but they are almost sure to have been of parchment, as papyrus was dearer and very brittle. Codices came into frequent use in the course of the third century, and paper rolls quickly became unusual. The old ones soon disappeared, as from eighty to a hundred years was a long life for a roll.)

'The woman said:

"I have no more."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Bos the public official[1]:

"Go in and search whether she has not any more."

'The public official said:

"I have searched and have not found anything else."

'Felix the perpetual flamen and guardian of the state said to Victorinus, Silvanus and Carosus:

"If anything has been kept back, the danger is yours."'

After these things had been read, Zenophilus said to Victor:

'Now confess without more ado.'

Victor answered:

'I was not there.'

Nundinarius the deacon said:

'We have seen letters to Bishops written[2] by Fortis.'

And he read out a copy of the accusation delivered to the Bishops[3] by Nundinarius the deacon.[4]

'Christ is witness and His Angels, that they with whom you have been in communion have been Betrayers—that is

[1] *Bovi servo publico.*

[2] *epistulas Episcoporum* ( = letters belonging to Bishops) *factas a Forte.*

[3] *legit exemplar libelli traditi Episcopis a Nundinario diacono.* The words *exemplar libelli traditi Episcopis* are wanting in the MS., no doubt through the carelessness of a copyist. They have been supplied from St. Augustine (*con. Cresc.* iii, 29). The MS. for *legit* has *legitur*, and it is thus printed by Ziwsa. *Libellus* is often used of a petition (e.g. those of heretics to Popes, or of Catholics to Popes against heretics), but it also often means a bill of accusation, as here.

[4] i.e. by himself.

to say, Silvanus of Cirta is a Betrayer, and a thief of the goods of the poor—a thing which all of you Bishops, priests, deacons, elders, know to be true concerning the four hundred pieces of money,[1] that were given by the noble woman Lucilla,[2] for the sake of which you conspired together that Majorinus might be made Bishop, whence came the schism. For Victor the fuller gave twenty pieces of money,[3] to be made priest, in your presence and in that of the people, as Christ knows and His angels.'

And a copy of a letter [4] was read aloud:

'Purpurius,[5] the Bishop, to his fellow Bishop Silvanus—Health in the Lord! Nundinarius the deacon, our son, has come to me and has begged of me to send this letter of supplication to your Holiness, that, if it be possible, there may be peace between you and him. For I wish this to be done in writing by you, if you are willing, in order that no one may know what is going on between us, so that I may alone be concerned with you in this present matter, and may bring to a conclusion [6] the dissension between you. For he has handed to me a petition written by his hand concerning the affair, on account of which, by your command, he was degraded.[7]

[1] *de quadringentis follibus.* Ducange tells us that *follis* was 'genus monetae, apud Byzantinos potissimum.' He does not specify its relative value.

[2] Cf. Optatus i, 16; cf. S. Aug. *Ep.* clxii; *con. Parmen.* i, 3.

[3] *folles viginti.* [4] *exemplum epistulae.*

[5] Purpurius of Limata in Numidia. St. Optatus accused him (i, 13), on the strength of the Acts of the Council of Cirta, of having murdered his sister's sons. These Acts have been preserved by St. Augustine (*contra Cresconium* iii, 27), where we read as follows: 'Secundus said to Purpurius of Limata: "It is said that you killed the two sons of your sister at Milevis." Purpurius answered him: "Do you think that I am terrified by you, like the rest? . . . I did kill them, and I kill those who act against me. So do not provoke me to say more!"' (Vide p. 418.)

[6] *amputem.*

[7] *lapidatus.* So St. Augustine understands it. But may it not perhaps be understood literally of *stoning*? Silvanus, no doubt, like Purpurius himself, was capable of anything.

It is not right [1] for a father to chastise a son against the truth, and I know that the things which were written in the bill of accusation that was handed to me are true. Search for a remedy by which this ill-will may be extinguished before the flame burst forth which it may not be possible afterwards to extinguish without the spiritual shedding of blood. Call together your fellow clerics and the elders of the people who belong to the Church,[2] and let them carefully inquire what are these dissensions of yours, that whatever is done may be done according to the precepts of the Faith. You shall not decline to the right hand nor to the left. Be not willing to lend your ear to evil teachers who refuse peace. You slay us all . . . [and, in another hand] Fare you well.'

And a copy of another letter :

' Purpurius the Bishop to the Clerics and Elders of Cirta—eternal health in the Lord ! Moses cried out to the whole assembly of the children of Israel and told them what the Lord commanded to be done. Nothing was to be done without the advice of the Elders. So do you too, my beloved, whom I know to have all heavenly and spiritual wisdom, search out with all your strength what is the nature of this dissension and bring [men] to peace. For Nundinarius the deacon says that you have knowledge of all the circumstances from which this dissension has arisen between our well-beloved Silvanus and himself. For he has handed me a petition in which all these things have been written. And he said that you too are acquainted with them. I know that no one can overhear.[3] Do you search out a satisfactory remedy that this thing may be extinguished without danger to your soul, for fear lest when

[1] *verum.* Cf. Livy (Book xxxii) : ' Ceterum et sociorum audiri postulata verum esse.'

[2] *ecclesiasticos viros, id est* men who belong to the Church, not heretics or schismatics. Purpurius means ' those who belong to our faction,' which he called the Church.

[3] *ego scio quia auris non est,* i.e. I write this to you all, because you know it already. I know there is no ear listening—no danger of the thing leaking out further. Du Pin, however, suggests *sileo* for *scio.*

you respect persons you should unawares find yourself before the Judge.[1] Judge just judgement between the parties in accordance with your gravity and justice. Be careful not to decline either to the right hand or to the left. There is question of a matter which belongs to God[2] who searcheth the thoughts of every man. Be careful that no one knows the story of this conspiracy. What is contained in the bill of accusation is true.[3] It is not good, for the Lord says "Out of thy mouth thou shalt be condemned and out of thy mouth shalt thou be justified."[4]'

This also was read out:

'Fortis to our well-beloved brother Silvanus, eternal health in the Lord! Our son Nundinarius the deacon has come to me and related the things which have taken place between you and him, through the intervention of the Evil One, who wishes to turn aside the souls of the just from the way of truth. When I heard these things I fainted in my spirit that such a dissension had come between you—that a priest of God should arrive at that . . .[5] which is not expedient for us to be done. Now therefore beseech him that you may have, as is possible, the peace of the Lord, the Saviour Christ, with him. Let us not come into a public court and be condemned by the Gentiles. For it has been written "Take heed lest, whilst you bite and accuse one another, you be devoured one by another."[6] Therefore I beseech the Lord that this scandal may be removed from our midst, so that this business, which concerns God, may be carried through with the giving of thanks,[7] as the Lord says "My peace I give unto you, My

[1] Cf. John vii, 24. [2] *Dei res agitur.*

[3] *vera sunt.* This is the emendation of Du Pin for the *vestra sunt* of the MS., which Ziwsa preserves. 'Vestra' *might* mean 'The things in the *Libellus* are for you alone—tell nobody.' (Cf. supra *Ego scio*—I know that there is no eavesdropper.) But in the preceding letter of Purpurius, we have a parallel passage: 'Et scio, quia *vera* sunt.'

[4] Matt. xii, 37. [5] Something evidently is missing here.

[6] Gal. iii, 15.

[7] *ut possit res Dei cum gratiarum actione celebrari*, cf. 'Dei res agitur' (supra).

peace I leave to you."[1] What peace can there be, where there is dissension and where there are rivalries? For when I was roasted by the soldiers,[2] and set apart, and had come to that pass[3] with such foul treatment,[4] I commended my soul to God and forgave you,[5] for God sees the minds of men, and [how, just like you, I was led into the deed you know of[6]]. But God has delivered us and we serve Him together with you. Therefore even as we have been forgiven, so be you two reconciled to peace, that you may be able to celebrate the peace of Easter[7] with joy in the Name of Christ. Let no one know about it. . . .'[8]

There was also read out:

'Fortis to the brethren and sons, to the clergy and seniors, eternal health in the Lord! Your deacon, Nundinarius, has come to me and told me of the things that have been done against you, which surely ought to have been adjusted by you in such a way that you should not have arrived at so great a

[1] John xiv, 27.

[2] *nam cum ego a milite essem ass . . . . separatus.* In the MS. four letters are wanting. Dom John Chapman suggests that they are *us et* (*assus et*), and I have translated this.

[3] *et in illo venissem.* This probably is corrupt. Ziwsa remarks 'Hic locus perobscurus medelam eludere videtur.' The sense seems sufficiently clear. Fortis came to the same pass as Silvanus, and gave up the books. *In illo venit.* He will not name the deed. Then he begged God's pardon and himself forgave Silvanus.

[4] *cum iniuria tali.* Fortis had been tortured, and at last had given way—so he says—if we are to believe him.

[5] *et remisi tibi.* He then forgave Silvanus, as he himself hoped to be forgiven.

[6] *eorum, sive a te ad illos perductus sum.* This is hopelessly corrupt. We seem to want something, like *quomodo, sicut et tu, ad illud perductus sum*; and so I have translated it, placing, however, the passage in square brackets.

[7] *et vos reconciliamini pace, ut . . . possimus cum gaudio pacem celebrare. Pacem*, that is the Peace of Easter. It is a play upon words, unless indeed for *Pacem* we should read *Pascha*, as below.

[8] There is here a lacuna of nine lines, at the end of which doubtless there were the usual introductory words for a new letter: *Item alia recitata.*

pitch of madness that men should be degraded[1] for telling the truth—a thing which both you and we know, even as you have related to us. And it is written "Is there not any wise man amongst you who can judge between brethren? But does brother go to law with brother—and this amongst the unbelievers?"[2]—just as you now strive in judgement.[3] Have things then come to this pass, that we should give such an example to the Gentiles, so that they who have believed in God through us, should themselves speak evil of us, when we come before the public? Therefore, that it may not come to this, do you who are spiritual see to it that no one should know, so that we may keep Easter with peace,[4] and do you exhort them to be reconciled to Peace, and that there may be no dissension, lest, should things be made public, you too commence to be in danger (if this should occur), and afterwards blame yourselves. You especially will take care, you, Possessor, Donatius the priest,[5] and Valerius and Victor, each of you,[6] who know all that was done[7]—take care[8] that you be at peace one with another.'

Another letter was also read out:

'Sabinus to his brother Silvanus,[9] eternal health in the Lord! Nundinarius your son has come to us—not only to

[1] *lapidarentur.* [Cf. n. 7, p. 359.]

[2] 1 Cor. vi. 5, 6.

[3] *vos nunc in iudicio contenditis.* Ziwsa reads *cum in iudicio non intenditis*—that is 'when you do not give your minds to judgement.'

[4] *ut cum Pace Pascha celebremus* (cf. supra 'cum gaudio Pacem [Pascha (?)] celebrare').

[5] *dabitis [operam] quamplurime, tu possessor Donati Presbyter.* It is printed in this way by both Du Pin and Ziwsa. But Possessor must be here the proper name of a Bishop (cf. the famous eighth century African Bishop, whose letter to Pope Hormisdas, about Scythian monks, is well known).

[6] *singuli.*

[7] *qui omnia scitis actum.* Ziwsa reads *acta* for *actum.*

[8] *date operam. Date* takes up *dabitis* above—an anacoluthon.

[9] *fratri Silvano Sabinus.* These words are not found in Ziwsa, nor are they in the MS. They were added by Baluzius, who writes 'certa est haec restitutio.' He says that Sabinus was a Numidian Bishop.

me but also to our brother Fortis, bringing a serious[1] complaint. I am surprised at your lordship,[2] that you have acted thus with your son, whom you brought up and ordained. For if an earthly building has been erected, is not something heavenly added to it, which is built by the hand of a priest ?[3] However, we ought not to be surprised at you, for the Scripture says "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise and I will reject the prudence of the prudent,"[4] and again it says "Men have loved the darkness rather than the light,"[5] just as you are doing.[6] It should be enough for you to know all the facts. Our brother Fortis has written to you about this. Now I would ask of your charity, my very kind brother, to fulfil the saying of the prophet Isaiah : "Cast evil forth from your souls, and come let us dispute together, saith the Lord." And again, "Cast forth wickedness from your midst."[7] So do you now act after this manner.[8] Overcome and avert the plot of those who have been unwilling that there should be peace between you and your son. No ! let your son Nundinarius keep Easter in peace with you,[9] that the matter which is already known to all of us may not became public as well. I would beg of you, my very kind brother, to fulfil the petition of my mediocrity. Let no one know about it.'

Also another letter was read aloud :[10]

'Sabinus to his brother Fortis, eternal health in the Lord ! How great is your charity according to the witness of all your colleagues, I know very well[11]; but that you have had a special

[1] The MS. has a play upon words. *ad fratrem nostrum Fortem, fortem et gravem querelam referens.* Ziwsa, however, (following Deutsch) omits the second *fortem.*

[2] *Gravitati tuae.*

[3] *Si enim aedificium terrae structum sit, non additur quid caeleste, quod per manum sacerdotis aedificatur ?*

[4] 1 Cor. i, 19. [5] John iii, 19. [6] *sicuti et tu facis.*

[7] Cf. Is. i, 16, 18. [8] *sic et tu fac.*

[9] *in pace tecum Pascha celebret.*

[10] There is here a lacuna in the MS.

[11] *certus sum peculiariter*; It is thus punctuated by Ziwsa, but it seems to me that the semi-colon should rather be placed after *sum,* and that *peculiariter* belongs to *coluisse* in the next sentence.

friendship with Silvanus,[1] according to the will of God, who has said "Some I love above my soul,"[2] I know too. Wherefore I have not hesitated to send you these writings, because I caused yours concerning Nundinarius to be given to him. If we act with diligence God's affair always goes vigorously.[3] Do not put forward an excuse. For business presses upon us during these days, and urges us without delay to see to these things before the most solemn Feast of Easter, that through you there may be brought about a peace full of fatness,[4] and we may be found worthy co-heirs of Christ, who has said "My peace I give unto you, My peace I leave to you." And once again I beseech you to do as I ask.' [And in another hand] 'I pray that you have good health in the Lord and are mindful of us. Fare you well. But I entreat you let no one know about it.'

After these documents had been read,[5] Zenophilus said:

'From the Acts and letters which have been read aloud, it is clear that Silvanus is a Betrayer.'

And he said to Victor:

'Frankly confess whether you know that he betrayed anything.'

Victor said:

'He did betray, but not in my presence.'

Zenophilus said:

'What office did Silvanus hold at the time amongst the clergy?'

Victor answered:

'The persecution broke out when Paul was Bishop; Silvanus was then a sub-deacon.'

[1] *Silvanum te coluisse.* [2] Cf. Jer. xxxi, 3; 1 John iv, 9.
[3] *impetu.* [4] *ut per te fiat pinguissima pax.*
[5] There is another lacuna here in the MS.

Nundinarius the deacon replied:

'When he came here, as he said to be made Bishop, the people answered "Let it be another,[1] hear us, O God."'

Zenophilus said to Victor:

'Did the people cry out "Silvanus is a Betrayer"?'

Victor said:

'I myself fought against his being made Bishop.'

Zenophilus said:

'So you did know that he was a Betrayer! Confess to this.'

Victor answered:

'He was a Betrayer.'

Nundinarius the deacon said:

'You seniors cried out "Hear us, O God! We want our fellow-citizen. This man is a Betrayer."'

Zenophilus said to Victor:

'So you cried out with the people that Silvanus was a Betrayer and ought not to be made Bishop?'

Victor said:

'I did cry out, and so did the people. For we wanted our fellow-citizen, a man of integrity.'

Zenophilus said:

'For what reason did you deem him unworthy?'

Victor said:

'We wanted one who was a man of integrity and our fellow-citizen. For I knew that for this reason we should have to go to the Emperor's Court, if the office were given to such as he.'

[1] We shall soon see that they wanted Donatus.

Then when Victor of Samsuricum and Saturninus the grave-diggers had been brought in and sworn, Zenophilus said :

' What is your name ? '

Saturninus said :

' Saturninus.'

Zenophilus said :

' What is your station in life ? '

Saturninus said :

' I am a grave-digger.'

Zenophilus said :

' Do you know that Silvanus is a Betrayer ? '

Saturninus said :

' I know that he gave up a silver lamp.'

Zenophilus said to Saturninus :

' What else ? '

Saturninus said :

' I do not know of anything else, excepting that he took the lamp from behind a tun.'

And after Saturninus had been ordered down, Zenophilus said to the one who remained standing :

' And you, what is your name ? '

He answered :

' Victor of Samsuricum.'

Zenophilus said :

' What is your station in life ? '

Victor said:

'I am an artisan.'

Zenophilus said:

'Who gave up the silver table[1]?'

Victor answered:

'I did not see—what I know I will tell you.'

Zenophilus said to Victor:

'Although it has now become certain from the replies of those whom we have already questioned, nevertheless, do you tell us whether Silvanus is a Betrayer.'

Victor said:

'When it was demanded a second time how it was that he dismissed this matter[2]—that we should be led to Carthage, I heard from the mouth of the Bishop himself: "There were given to me a silver lamp and a silver casket,[3] and these I gave up."'

Zenophilus said to Victor of Samsuricum:

'From whom did you hear that?'

Victor said:

'From Silvanus the Bishop.'

Zenophilus said to Victor:

[1] *tabulam argenteam.*

[2] *secundo petato quomodo hoc dimisit, ut duceremur ad Carthaginem.* I have translated this sentence making *Silvanus* the subject of *dimisit*; in this case *hoc dimisit* = 'dismissed this matter' (i.e. escaped the penalty). But *the magistrate* may be the subject—'how it was that the magistrate discharged the matter—that is, that we should be led' etc. For *petato* Voelter (*Der Ursprung des Donatismus*, Freiburg 1883, p. 56) reads *placito.*

[3] *capitulata.*

'Did you hear from himself that he had been a Betrayer?'

Victor said:

'I heard him say that he gave up these things with his own hands.'

Zenophilus said:

'Where did you hear that?'

Victor said:

'In the basilica.'

Zenophilus said:

'At Cirta[1]?'

Victor said:

'He began there his address to the people with these words: "On what ground do they say that I am a Betrayer? Is it because of the lamp and the casket[2]?"'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius:

'What else is there about which you think that we should question these men?'

Nundinarius said:

'About the casks belonging to the imperial treasury.[3] Who took them away?'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius:

'What casks?'

[1] *apud Constantinam.* [2] *capitulata.*

[3] *de cupis fisci.* We shall see that the casks were of vinegar. *Fiscus* denoted the imperial revenue, as opposed to the *aerarium*, the Senate's treasury.

Nundinarius said :

' They were in the temple of Serapis, and Purpurius the Bishop took them away. The vinegar that they contained was taken away by Silvanus the Bishop, Dontius the priest, and Lucianus.'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius :

' Do these men who are before us know that this was done ? '

Nundinarius answered :

' Yes.'

Saturninus the deacon said :

' Our fathers told us that they were taken away.'

Zenophilus said :

' By whom—as it is alleged—were they taken away ? '

Saturninus said :

' By Purpurius the Bishop, and the vinegar by Silvanus and Dontius and Superius the priests, and Lucianus the deacon.'

Nundinarius said :

' Did Victor give twenty pieces of money and was he made a priest ? '

Saturninus said :

' Yes.'

And when he had said this, Zenophilus said to Saturninus :

' To whom did he give the money ? '

Saturninus said :

' To Silvanus the Bishop.'

Zenophilus said to Saturninus:

'Then he gave twenty pieces of money as a bribe to Silvanus the Bishop, that he might be made a priest?'

Saturninus said:

'Yes.'

Zenophilus said to Saturninus:

'Was the money laid before Silvanus?'

Saturninus said:

'It was laid before the Episcopal Chair.'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius:

'By whom was the money taken away?'

Nundinarius said:

'The Bishops divided it among themselves.'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius:

'Do you wish Donatus to be called?'

Nundinarius said:

'By all means let him come, for the people cried out about him two days after the Peace[1]: "Hear us, O God, we wish for our fellow-citizen."'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius:

'Is it certain the people cried out this?'

He answered:

'Yes.'

Zenophilus said to Saturninus:

'Did they cry out that Silvanus was a Betrayer?'

[1] *post Pacem* = 'after the Peace' = after the cessation of persecution, when it was possible to elect a new Bishop.

Saturninus said:

'Yes.'

Nundinarius said:

'When he was made Bishop, we did not communicate with him because it was said that he was a Betrayer.'

Saturninus said:

'What he says is true.'

Nundinarius said:

'I saw Mutus the worker in the sand-quarries [1] carry him on his shoulders.[2]'

Zenophilus said to Saturninus:

'Did it happen in this way?'

Saturninus said:

'Yes, in this way.'

Zenophilus said:

'Is everything that Nundinarius says true—how Silvanus was made Bishop by the quarry-men?'

Saturninus said:

'It is all true.'

Nundinarius said:

'Common women were there.'

Zenophilus said to Saturninus:

'Did the quarry-men chair him?'

[1] *harenarius.* *Harenaria* (less correctly *arenaria*) is a sand-pit, or a catacomb in sand, like those which lead into the Roman catacombs.

[2] *tulit eum in collo.*

Saturninus said:

'They and the populace carried him; the citizens were shut up in the Martyrs' Hall.'[1]

Nundinarius the Deacon said:

'Were the people of God there?'

Saturninus said:

'They were shut up in the big shed.'[2]

Zenophilus said:

'Is it certain that everything which Nundinarius says is true?'

Saturninus said:

'It is all true.'

Zenophilus said:

'And what do you say?'

Victor said:

'All is true, my Lord.'

Nundinarius said:

'Purpurius the Bishop took away a hundred pieces of money.'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius:

'Of whom in your opinion ought we to ask questions about the four hundred pieces of money?'

Nundinarius said:

'Let Lucianus the Deacon be brought forward, for he knows everything.'

[1] *in area martyrum* = 'Court of the Martyrs,' probably the *atrium* of a Church of the Martyrs.

[2] *in casa maiore.* A penthouse roof probably ran round the court, with pillars. The largest side would be the *casa maior.*

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius:

'Do these men know about it?'

Nundinarius said:

'No.'

Zenophilus said:

'Let Lucianus be brought forward.'

Nundinarius said:

'They do know that the four hundred pieces of silver were received, but they do not know that the Bishops shared them.'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius[1] and to Victor:

'Do you know that the money was received from Lucilla?'

Saturninus and Victor said:

'We do know it.'

Zenophilus said:

'Did not the poor get it?'

They said:

'No one got anything.'

Zenophilus said to Saturninus and Victor:

'Was nothing taken away from the temple of Serapis?'

Saturninus and Victor said:

'Purpurius took away the casks, and Silvanus the Bishop, and Dontius and Superius the priests, and Lucianus the deacon, took away the vinegar.'

[1] *Nundinario* in MS. But this clearly is an error. It should be *Saturnino*.

Zenophilus said :

'By the answers of Victor the Grammarian and of Victor of Samsuricum and of Saturninus, it has been made clear that all the statements of Nundinarius are true. Let them be dismissed, and go their way.'

Zenophilus said :

'Who else is there that you think ought to be questioned ? '

Nundinarius said :

'Castus the deacon, that he may tell us whether Silvanus is not a Betrayer, for he ordained him.'

And when Castus the deacon had been called in and sworn, Zenophilus said :

'What is your name ? '

He answered :

'Castus.'

Zenophilus said to Castus :

'What is your state of life ? '

Castus said :

'I have no dignity.'

Zenophilus said to Castus :

'Although the charges of Nundinarius have now been admitted to be true, through the evidence of Victor the Grammarian, as well as through that of Victor of Samsuricum and of Saturninus, nevertheless, do you also tell us whether Silvanus is a Betrayer ? '

Castus answered :

'He said that he found a lamp behind a tun.'

Zenophilus said to Castus :

' Tell us also about the casks taken from the temple of Serapis and the vinegar.' [1]

Castus answered :

' Purpurius the Bishop took away the casks.'

Zenophilus said :

' Who took the vinegar ? '

Castus answered that Silvanus the Bishop and Dontius and Superius the priests took the vinegar out of the temple.

Zenophilus said to Castus :

' Tell us how many pieces of money Victor gave to be made priest.'

Castus said :

' He offered, my lord, a little money-bag,[2] but what it held I know not.'

Zenophilus said to Castus :

' To whom was the bag given ? '

Castus said :

' He took it with him to the big shed.'

Zenophilus said to Castus :

' Was not the money divided among the people ? '

Castus answered :

'As far as I saw, it was not given to them.'

[1] *de cupas de fano et aceto* (we may note the use of *de* with accusative and ablative in the same sentence).

[2] *saccellum* : hence the English word *satchel*.

Zenophilus said to Castus :

' Did not the poor people [1] get any of the money which Lucilla had given ? '

Castus said :

' I did not see anybody get anything.'

Zenophilus said to Castus :

' Where then did the money go ? '

Castus said :

' I do not know.'

Nundinarius said :

' Surely you either heard or saw it, if it was said to the poor : " Lucilla, out of her substance, makes you also a present " ? '

Castus said :

' I did not see anyone get anything.'

Zenophilus said :

' The evidence of Castus is quite clear, that he has no knowledge that the money which Lucilla gave was distributed among the people. So let him be dismissed.'

And when Crescentianus the subdeacon was called in and sworn, Zenophilus said :

' What is your name ? '

He answered :

' Crescentianus.'

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

' Tell us frankly, as the rest have done, whether you know that Silvanus is a Betrayer.'

[1] *populus minutus* = the people in ' reduced ' circumstances, literally ' reduced people.'

Crescentianus said :

'The clerics who were called before me have related everything.'

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

'What have they related ?'

Crescentianus said :

'They related that he was a Betrayer.'

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

'Did they say that he was a Betrayer ? And,' he added, 'Who said it ?'

Crescentianus said :

'Those who lived with him among the people said that he had once betrayed.'

Zenophilus said :

'Did they say this of Silvanus ?'

Crescentianus said :

'Yes.'

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

'Were you there when he was made Bishop ?'

Crescentianus said :

'I was present with the people, but shut up in the big shed.'

Nundinarius the deacon said :

'The country people and quarry-men[1] made him Bishop.'

[1] *campeses et havenarii. Campeses* for *campenses.*

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

' Is there no doubt that it was Mutus the quarry-man who carried him ? '

He said :

' There is no doubt about it.'

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

' Is it within your knowledge that casks were taken away from the temple of Serapis ? '

Crescentianus said :

' Several persons used to say that Bishop Purpurius himself took the casks and the vinegar, which came to our senior Bishop Silvanus,[1] and the sons of Aelion said so.'

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

' What did you hear ? '

Crescentianus said that the vinegar had been taken away by the senior Bishop Silvanus,[2] and by Dontius and Superius the priests and Lucian the deacon.

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

' Did the people get any of the four hundred pieces of money, the gift of Lucilla ? '

Crescentianus said :

' No one to my knowledge had any of it, nor do I know who spent the money.'

[1] *ad senem nostrum Silvanum.* ' Senex ' meant the senior Bishop of an African province, who was *ipso facto* Primate (as Secundus was of Numidia), except, of course, in Proconsularis, where Carthage had primacy. It appears that Silvanus was now senior Bishop of Numidia, unless *senex* is only an honorific title in the subdeacon's mouth = ' our venerable Silvanus.'

[2] *a sene Silvano.*

Nundinarius said :

' Did no old women ever get any of it ? '

Crescentianus said :

' No.'

Zenophilus said :

' It is certain that whenever any gift of this kind is made, all the populace receive their part of it in public.'

Crescentianus said :

' I neither heard nor saw that he gave any.'

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

' None then of the four hundred pieces of money were given to the people ? '

Crescentianus said :

' None—otherwise surely some small trifle [1] would have come to us.'

Zenophilus said :

' Where then was the money taken ? '

Crescentianus said :

' I do not know. No one got anything.'

Nundinarius said :

' How much money did Victor give to be made priest ? '

Crescentianus said :

' I saw that he brought baskets with money in them.'

Zenophilus said to Crescentianus :

' To whom were the baskets given ? '

[1] *aliqua partiuncula.*

Crescentianus said :

' To Silvanus the Bishop.'

Zenophilus said :

' Were they given to Silvanus ? '

Crescentianus said :

' Yes, to Silvanus.'

Zenophilus said :

' Was nothing given to the people ? '

He answered :

' Nothing. We too must have received something if the distribution had been made in the usual manner.'

Zenophilus said to Nundinarius :

' What else is there that you think should be asked of Crescentianus ? '

Nundinarius said :

' His evidence is the very thing.[1] Since Crescentianus the subdeacon has given his evidence frankly about everything, let him be dismissed.'

Then when Januarius the subdeacon was brought in and sworn, Zenophilus said :

' What is your name ? '

He answered :

(What followed in the manuscript is lost.)

[1] *ipsud est.*

## APPENDIX—III

## CONSTANTINUS AUGUSTUS AELAFIO

### Introduction

In this letter Constantine sends orders to his Vicar in Africa that Caecilian and certain other Bishops (both Catholic and Donatist) should be directed to proceed, with some of their clergy, to Arles, where a Council was to be held (as he explains) once more publicly to vindicate the character of Caecilian. The date is 314.

This letter may be compared with another letter sent by Constantine to Chrestus, Bishop of Syracuse, and preserved for us by Eusebius (x, 5). In both these letters August 1 is fixed as the date for the opening of the Council at Arles; in both we find a reference to the Council which had been already held at Rome under Miltiades. Indeed the similarity between them is so striking that it has been suggested that the letter to Aelafius is a forgery and has been copied from that to Chrestus. But Mgr. Duchesne has shown (*op. cit.* p. 32) that this is quite impossible, since the letter to Chrestus was unknown in Africa, at the time when the letter to Aelafius was placed in the collection used by Optatus. The only edition of Eusebius known to St. Augustine, for example, was the version of Rufinus, where Book Ten (containing the letter to Chrestus) is wanting.

It has also been urged as an argument against the authenticity of *the Letter to Aelafius* that the Bishops are herein ordered to adopt a most improbable itinerary. They were directed to follow the coast of Mauritania,

thence to pass into Spain, and then to travel to Arles by land; whereas it has been pointed out that it would have been far simpler and cheaper to embark at Carthage, or Hippo, and go straight to Marseilles by sea. But here again Mgr. Duchesne has observed, with irrefutable force, that if *the Letter to Aelafius* be not genuine, it must have been composed by an African of the fourth century. During the course of that century there is no reason to suppose that there was any change of routes. And (to quote the words of Duchesne):

> 'The Africans who were the contemporaries of St. Optatus knew how people went from their own country into Gaul. No one of them, had he forged such a letter as this, would ever have dreamed of placing within it an impossible itinerary.'

On the other hand we can nowadays know but little of the circumstances which may well have caused the itinerary described in this letter to have been chosen for the journey of the Bishops to Gaul. So we may safely conclude, with Duchesne, that as to the authenticity of the letter there is no room for genuine doubt.

## CONSTANTINE THE EMPEROR TO AELAFIUS[1]

Already some time back, since it was brought to my knowledge that many persons in our dominion of Africa had begun to separate from one another with mad fury, and had brought purposeless accusations against each other about the keeping of the most holy Catholic Law, I thought it well, in order to settle this quarrel, that Caecilian the Bishop of Carthage, against whom especially they all often petitioned me, should go to the City of Rome, and that some of those who had deemed fit to bring certain charges against him, should appear as well. I also ordered some Bishops from the Gauls to proceed to our above-mentioned City of Rome, that, by the integrity of their lives and praiseworthy manner of living, together with seven Bishops of the same Communion, and the Bishop[2] of the City of Rome, and their assessors, they might give due attention to the questions which had been raised. Now they brought to my knowledge, by the written Acts of their meeting, all that had been done in

[1] *Aelafio.* We do not meet this name elsewhere. It is almost certainly an error of the copyists. Du Pin (without giving any reason for his choice) suggests *Ablavio.* Mgr. Duchesne, however, (p. 61) with his usual acumen, identifies this Aelafius of the corrupt MS. with the Aelius Paulinus of whom we have read at the beginning of the *Acta Purgationis Felicis* (cf. Opt. i, 27). For the recipient of this letter evidently was Constantine's Vicar in Africa, and no one else could be charged with the public conveyance of Bishops of Numidia, Byzacium, and Mauritania. Now Patritius was Vicar from the end of 312 to the beginning of 313 (cf. S. Aug. *con. Cresc.* iii, 81 etc.), Verus was Vicar in February 315. Shortly before Verus, Aelius Paulinus. It is therefore in all probability his name which is hidden beneath the group of letters Aelafius. The following then is the succession of Vicars of Africa in the early years of Constantine. (1) Patritius, (2) Aelius Paulinus=Aelafius, (3) Verus, (4) Domitius Celsus, (5) Eumelius, (6) Verinus.

[2] Episcopus. The MS. reads *episcopi*—of course this is a mistake.

their presence, affirming also by word of mouth that their judgement was based upon equity, and declaring that not Caecilian, but those who brought charges against him, were guilty—so that, after giving their judgement, they forbade the latter to go back to Africa.[1] Wherefore, in consequence of all this I once hoped that, in accordance with the probable issue of events, a fitting end had been made to all the seditions and contentions of every kind which had been suddenly called into being by the other party. But after I had read your letters, which you had deemed it your duty to send to Nicasius and the rest, about the crafty pretext of these men, I recognised clearly that they would not place before their eyes either considerations of their own salvation, or (what is of more importance) the reverence which is due to Almighty God—for they are persisting in a line of action which not merely leads to their shame and disgrace, but also gives an opportunity of detraction to those who are known to turn their minds away from the keeping of the most holy Catholic Law. I write thus because—and this is a thing which it is well that you should know—some have come from these men, asserting that the above-mentioned Caecilian is deemed not to be worthy of the worship of our most holy religion,[2] and in answer to my reply that they were making an empty boast (since the affair had been terminated in the City of Rome by competent men of the highest character, who were Bishops), they thought fit to answer with persistent obstinacy that the whole case had not been heard, but that these Bishops had shut themselves up somewhere and given the judgement as was most convenient to themselves.[3] Wherefore, since I perceived that these numerous and important affairs were being pertinaciously delayed by discussions, so that it appeared

[1] Cf. Opt. i, 26 (n. 4, p. 29).

[2] *minus dignus idem Caecilianus cultu sanctissimae religionis habeatur.*

[3] Cf. p. 328, n. 1.

that no end could be made of them without both Caecilian and three of those who are making a schism against him coming to the town of Arles, for the judgement of those who are opposed to Caecilian, and are bound to accept him as Bishop,[1] I have deemed it well to impose upon your care to provide, as soon as you receive this letter of mine, that the above-mentioned Caecilian with some of those whom he himself shall choose—and also some from the provinces of Byzacium, Tripolis, the Numidias and the Mauritanias, and each of the provinces, (and these must bring a certain number of their clergy[2] whom they shall choose)—and also some of those who have made a schism against Caecilian (public conveyance being provided[3] through Africa and Mauritania) shall travel thence by a short course to Spain. In the same way[4] you shall provide in Spain each Bishop with a single right of conveyance[5] so that they may all arrive at the above-mentioned place[6]

[1] *consensumque debent* = they owe him their approval as Bishop.

[2] *aliquantos ex suis.* [3] *data evectione publica.*

[4] *nihilominus* ( = *huiusmodi*, in the same way).

[5] *his in singulis Episcopis singulas tractorias tribuas.* In his *History of the Conference at Carthage*, A.D. 411 (reprinted by Du Pin in his Optatus), Balduinus writes as follows: 'Nolo hoc loco praeterire quod ipse Augustinus in *Lib. post Collat.* cap. 24 ait Donatistas a Primate suo per Tractoriam fuisse evocatos. Tractoria verbum est iuris nostri, sicuti et in eadem prope significatione, *Evectio*, quo etiam verbo utitur Augustinus *lib.* 5 *Confess.* Significat autem libellum vel diploma ut missis aut evocatis detur viaticum de publico, et ut uti possint cursu publico. Exstat lib. xii. *Cod. Titul. de Tract.* ubi Interpres praeterea refert quoddam fragmentum cuiusdam edicti Constantini facientis memoriam Tractoriarum et Evectionis publicae dandae Donatistis propter caussam Caeciliani.'

Constantine gave the same right of public conveyances to the Bishops for Nicaea, and his successors did the same for all the great Councils of the Church—they had the Bishops conveyed at the public cost in the regular imperial post-chaises. So this letter of Constantine with regard to the Council of Arles is rendered more interesting from the fact that thereby he set the example for future Emperors.

[6] Arles.

by August 1; furthermore you will be pleased to convey to them without delay that it is their duty to provide, before they depart, for suitable discipline in their absence, in order that no sedition or contention of disputing parties may arise—a thing which would be the greatest disgrace.[1] As to the rest,[2] after the matter has been fully inquired into, let it be brought to an end. For when they shall all have come together, those things which are now known to be subjects of contention should with reason receive a timely conclusion,[3] and be forthwith finished and arranged. I confess to your Lordship, since I am well aware that you also are a worshipper of the most High God, that I consider it by no means right that contentions and altercations of this kind should be hidden from me, by which, perchance, God may be moved not only against the human race, but also against me myself, to whose care, by His heavenly Decree, He has entrusted the direction of all human affairs, and may in His wrath provide[4] otherwise than heretofore. For then shall I be able to remain truly and most fully without anxiety, and may always hope for all most prosperous and excellent things from the ever-ready kindness of the most powerful God, when I shall know that all, bound together in brotherly concord, adore the most holy God with the worship of the Catholic religion, that is His due.

[1] Above is a translation of a sentence twenty lines long in the Latin, with several anacolutha.

[2] *de cetero*, an emendation for the *de secreto* of the MS., which cannot be translated.

[3] *quaeque non inmerito finem debent accipere maturum.* This can only be translated by leaving out *quaeque*, which has probably slipped into the MS.

[4] *decernat.* The MS. reads *decernet.*

## APPENDIX—IV

# EPISTOLA CONCILII ARELATENSIS AD SILVESTRUM PAPAM, A.D. 314

### Introduction

The authenticity of this letter has never been contested. It is to be found, though under a slightly different form, in the collection of Canons of Merovingian Gaul, where it has been derived, not from African sources, but from the Archives of the Church of Arles.

In all probability a letter was also sent from the Council, announcing its decisions, to the Church of Carthage. But if so, this letter has been lost.

In the same way the Council of Sardica, at the conclusion of its labours, sent two letters (both extant), one to the Pope, the second to the Church of Alexandria. We also possess a letter from the Council of Nicaea to Alexandria; the letter from Nicaea to the Pope has shared the same fate as the letter from Arles to Carthage. That there was such a letter can hardly be doubted. As Duchesne writes (p. 15):

> 'Il n'est guère douteux que les légats de Silvestre au Concile de Nicée n'aient rapporté une lettre de cette assemblée, accompagnant, comme pour le Concile d'Arles, l'envoi des Canons disciplinaires.'

## Letter of the Council of Arles to Pope Silvester.

To the most beloved Pope Silvester: Marinus, Acratius, Natalis, Theodore, Proterius, Vocius, Verus, Probatius, Caecilian, Faustinus, Surgentius, Gregory, Reticius, Ambitausus, Termatius, Merocles, Pardus, Adelfius, Hibernius, Fortunatus, Aristasius, Lampadius, Vitalis, Maternus, Liberius, Gregory, Crescens, Avitianus, Dafnus, Orantalis, Quintasius, Victor, Epictetus, eternal health in the Lord!

Being united by the common tie of charity, and by that unity which is the bond of our mother, the Catholic Church, we have been brought to the City of Arles by the wish of the most pious Emperor, and we salute thee with the reverence which is thy due,[1] most glorious Pope. Here we have suffered from troublesome men, dangerous to our law and tradition—men of undisciplined mind,[2] whom both the authority of our God, which is with us,[3] and our tradition and the rule of truth reject, because[4] they neither have reasonableness in their argument, nor any moderation in their accusations, nor was their manner of proof to the point.[5] Therefore by the Judgement of God and of Mother Church, who knows and approves her own, they have been either condemned or rejected.[6]

[1] *merita reverentia salutamus.*

[2] The Editors read *graves ac perniciosos legi nostrae atque traditioni effrenatae mentis homines pertulimus.* Ziwsa for *graves ac perniciosos* reads *gravem ac perniciosam*, for *legi*, *traditioni*, he reads *legis*, *traditionis*, and supplies *iniuriam et* between *traditionis* and *effrenatae.*

[3] *Dei nostri praesens auctoritas.*

[4] *ita respuit, ut.*

[5] *ut nulla in iis aut dicendi ratio subsisteret aut accusandi modus ullus aut probatio conveniret.*

[6] *aut damnati sunt aut repulsi.*

And would, most beloved Brother, that you had deemed it well to be present at this great spectacle. We believe surely that in that case a more severe sentence would have been passed against them; and our assembly would have exulted with a greater joy, had you passed Judgement together with us. But since you were by no means able to leave that region, where the Apostles daily sit, and their blood without ceasing bears witness to the glory of God, it did not seem to us that by reason of your absence,[1] most well-beloved Brother, we ought to deal exclusively with those matters, on account of which we had been summoned, but we judged that we also should take counsel on our own affairs; because, as the countries from which we come are different, so events of various kinds will happen which we think that we ought to watch and regulate.[2] Accordingly we thought well in the presence of the Holy Spirit and His Angels that from among the various matters which occurred to each of us,[3] we should make some decrees to provide for the present state of tranquillity. We also agreed to write first to you,[4] who hold [the government of] the greater dioceses,[5] that by

[1] *tamen.*

[2] *observare.*

[3] The MS. has *ex his qui singulos quos monebat.* Du Pin observes that there must be a lacuna between *quos* and *monebat.* Ziwsa changes *quos* to *quosque* and *monebat* to *movebant.* This I have translated in the text.

[4] The MS. reads *antequam ante a te.* This is manifestly corrupt. Ziwsa reads *antea ad te scribi.*

[5] *qui maiores dioeceseos tenes* (so the MS. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, i. 204, note 2, suggests that the word *gubernacula* had fallen out. In this case *maiores* should be *maioris*). The editors read *maiores dioeceses. Dioecesis* is a province of the Empire (cf. 'mirifica expectatio est Asiae nostrarum dioecesium' Cic.). Antioch, for example, was the capital of the *dioecesis Oriens*, and the Bishop or Patriarch of Antioch had jurisdiction over that vast province. The context shows that the Pope is over all these 'greater provinces,' so that he can intimate the decision to the whole East and West.

you especially they should be brought to the knowledge of all.[1] What it is that we have determined on, we have appended to this writing of our insignificance. But in the first place, we were bound to discuss a matter that concerned the usefulness of our life. Now since [2] one died and rose again for many, the same season should be observed with a religious mind by all at the same time, lest divisions or dissensions might arise in so great a service of devotion. We judge, therefore, that the Pasch of the Lord should be observed throughout the world upon the same day.

Also, concerning those who have been ordained clerics in any places whatsoever, we have decreed that they remain fixed in the same places. Concerning those too [3] who throw down their arms in time of peace,[4] we have decreed that they should be kept from communion. Concerning the wandering agitators who belong to the Faithful, we have decreed that, as long as they continue their agitation, they be debarred from communion.

Concerning the strolling players we have decreed that, as long as they act, they be debarred from communion. Concerning those [heretics] [5] who are weighed down by illness and wish to believe,[6] we have decreed that hands be laid upon them. Concerning magistrates who belong to the Faithful and are appointed to office, we have determined that, when they are promoted, they should receive ecclesiastical letters of communion, but in such a way that in whatever place they may be living, the Bishop of that place shall have a heed to them, and if they begin to act against discipline, they be then excluded from communion. We have decreed similarly with regard to those who wish

[1] *per te potissimum omnibus insinuari.*
[2] Reading, with Ziwsa, *quia* for the *qui* of the MS.
[3] Reading with the editors *de his etiam* for *de his agitur* of the MS.
[4] *qui arma proiiciunt in pace.*
[5] *de his.* The MS. has *de his agitur.*
[6] *credere.* So Ziwsa. The MS. has *recedere.*

to hold state offices. Moreover, with regard to the Africans,[1] inasmuch as they use their own law of rebaptising, we have decreed that if any heretic comes to the Church, he should be questioned concerning the Creed, and if it be found that he has been baptised in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, hands shall be laid upon him and no more.[2] But if, on being questioned as to the Creed, he does not give the Trinity in answer, then let him rightly be baptised, and the rest, etc.[3]

Then giving over,[4] he commanded all to return to their homes. Amen.

[1] The MS. has *de Africa*. The editors read *de Afris*.

[2] *manus tantum ei imponatur*.

[3] *etcetera*. The text of the letter is here broken off, and the interruption is marked by an *etcetera*.

[4] *tunc taedians iussit omnes ad sedes suas redire—amen. Taedians*, literally, 'being sick of the affair.' This is clearly no longer in the epistolary but narrative style. It evidently means to say that Constantine was now weary of the whole thing, and sent all those who had assisted at the Council back to their homes. Duchesne argues (*op. cit.* p. 10) that this 'débris de phrase' proves clearly that there was, besides the documents in the *dossier*, a running commentary, which held them together ('un récit qui les reliat'). He says that no doubt there was originally to be found in this place a statement (after the letter had been finished) as to the protests raised by the Donatists against the decision of the Council, of the Emperor's useless efforts for peace, and that he then grew tired of it all. If so, the last line of this document alone remains to tell the tale.

## APPENDIX—V

### EPISTOLA CONSTANTINI IMPERATORIS AD EPISCOPOS CATHOLICOS POST SYNODUM ARELATENSE SCRIPTA A.D. 314 *circa finem.*

#### Introduction

Two objections, both of them sufficiently flimsy, have been brought against the authenticity of this letter, from which St. Optatus quotes twice (i, 23, 25, cf. pp. 44, 49), though, as we have seen, he was mistaken as to its date.

It has been urged that the indignation of Constantine at an appeal having been made to him from the decision of the Bishops is overdone, and it has been represented that the piety of its expressions is strange as emanating from an Emperor in an official document. To the first objection we may reply that Constantine might well be shocked. As Emperor, he could have no right to settle the purely ecclesiastical question who was the legitimate Bishop of Carthage, though in this capacity he considered it his duty to provide for the ecclesiastical trial of such matters as they arose, and deemed himself bound to enforce Catholic law and discipline (when it had been duly determined) throughout his dominions; as a Christian, he was still in the lowest rank, a catechumen. Small wonder then if he was scandalised, and expressed his scornful anger, at the behaviour of the Donatists in his regard. As for the piety of the tone of this letter, Duchesne observes that Constantine's letter to Chrestus of Syracuse, concerning the authenticity of which no one doubts, is equally full of pious expressions. Besides, Constantine seems to

have been fond of preaching to his subjects on occasion. 'Il a toujours beaucoup sermonné ses sujets. Sa vie écrite par Eusèbe et les autres documents que l'on a de son activité oratoire en ce genre, même certaines lois du code théodosien, nous édifient suffisamment là-dessus.' (*Op. cit.* p. 39.)

Moreover, this letter may perhaps have been touched up by an ecclesiastical secretary, of whom Constantine had several in his household. One of them, Hosius, the celebrated Bishop of Cordova, was certainly closely involved in these African controversies (cf. Eusebius, *E.H.* x, 6). However this may be, there is no doubt that Constantine felt the bad conduct of the Donatists very deeply. Whatever we may think as to the form of this letter, its substance is certainly his. Expressions may have been placed upon his lips, or made to flow from his pen. But this happens not seldom to personages of high estate Whatever was written in an official document, such as the one before us, he adopted and made his own.

## Letter of Constantine to the Catholic Bishops.

Constantine Augustus, to his dearest brothers, the Catholic Bishops, Health! The everlasting and worshipful, the incomprehensible kindness of our God by no means allows the weakness of men to wander for too long a time in the darkness. Nor does it suffer the perverse wills of some to come to such a pass as not to give them anew by its most splendid light a saving passage, opening the way so that they may be converted to the rule of justice. I have indeed experienced this by many examples. I can also describe it from myself. For in me of old there were things that were far from right, nor did I think that the power of God saw anything of what I carried amongst the secrets of my heart. Surely this ought to have brought me a just retribution, flowing over with all evils. But Almighty God, who sitteth in the watchtower of Heaven,[1] hath bestowed upon me gifts which I deserved not. Of a truth, those things which of His Heavenly kindness He has granted to me, His servant, can neither be told nor counted. On this account, O most holy Bishops of Christ the Saviour, my dearest brothers, I indeed rejoice; yes, in a special way do I rejoice, that at length, after you have held a most impartial inquiry, you have recalled to a better hope and fortune those whom the wickedness of the devil seemed by his wretched persuasion to have turned away from the most noble light of the Catholic Law. Oh, truly triumphant Providence of Christ the Saviour, to come to the rescue of those who, already falling away from the truth, and in a certain manner taking up arms against it, had joined themselves to the Gentiles! For, if even now they will consent with

[1] *in caeli specula residens.* This is Ziwsa's emendation. The MS. has *secula.* Du Pin suggests *per saecula.*

pure [1] faith to make their obedience to the most holy Law, they will be able to understand how great a provision has been made for them by the Will of God. And this, my most holy brothers, I hoped might be found even in those in whom the greatest hardness of heart has been engendered. But your right judgement has not been of any avail to them, nor has the merciful God made an entrance into their dispositions. In truth, not undeservedly has the mercy of Christ departed far from those men, in whom it is as clear as the sun of noon-day,[2] that they are of such a character, as to be seen to be shut off even from the care of Heaven, since so great a madness still holds them captive, and with unbelievable arrogance they persuade themselves of things which cannot lawfully be either spoken or heard—departing from the right judgement that was given, from which, as through the provision of Heaven I have learnt [3] they are appealing to my judgement—Oh, what force has the wickedness which even yet is persevering in their breasts!

How often have they been crushed already by myself in a reply, which, by their most shameless approaches to me, they have deservedly brought upon themselves. Surely, if they had kept this before their eyes, they would never have ventured on this appeal of theirs. They ask judgement from me, who am myself waiting for the judgement of Christ.[4] For I declare—as is true—that the judgement of Bishops ought to be looked upon as if the Lord Himself were sitting in Judgement.[5] For it is not lawful for them [6] to think or to judge in any other way,

[1] *mera* ( = unmingled, pure). Du Pin suggests *vera*.

[2] *manifesta luce claret.*

[3] *comperi* (i.e. by your letter to me from Arles).

[4] *meum iudicium postulant, qui ipse iudicium Christi expecto.* Famous words. Cf. Optatus i, 23.

[5] *dico enim, ut se veritas habet, sacerdotum iudicium ita debet haberi, ac si Dominus residens iudicet.*

[6] i.e. the Bishops.

excepting as they have been taught by the teaching of Christ.[1] Why then, as I have said with truth, do wicked men seek the devil's services? They search after worldly things, deserting those which are heavenly.[2] Oh, mad daring of their rage! They have made an appeal, as is done in the lawsuits of the pagans.[3] For pagans are accustomed sometimes to escape from the lower courts where justice may be obtained speedily, and through the authority of higher tribunals to have recourse to an appeal. What of those shirkers of the law[4] who refuse the judgement of Heaven, and have thought fit to ask for mine?[5] Do they thus think of Christ the Saviour? Behold, they are now 'Betrayers.' Behold, without any need for disputatious examination, of their own accord they have themselves betrayed their wicked deeds. How can they, who have leapt savagely upon God Himself, feel as men should feel?

But, my dearest Brothers, although this wickedness has been discovered in them, nevertheless do you, who follow the way[6] of the Lord the Saviour, show patience, and still give them a choice to choose what they may think well. And if you see that they persevere in the same courses, do you go your way, and return to your own Sees, and remember me, that our Saviour may always have mercy on me. But I have directed my men to bring these wicked deceivers of religion to my court that they may live there, and there survey for themselves what is worse than death.[7] I have also sent a suitable letter

[1] *nisi quod Christi magisterio sunt edocti.*

[2] *perquirunt saecularia, relinquentes caelestia.*

[3] Cf. Optatus i, 25.

[4] *detractores legis.*

[5] The pagans appealed from the lower courts to the higher, the Donatists from the higher to the lower, from the ecclesiastical to the civil, from the judgement of Heaven (of Bishops) to that of earth (the Emperor's).

[6] *viam* (cf. Acts ix, 2).

[7] *ibi sibi mortem peius pervideant.* For *mortem* we must read *morte.*

to the prefect who is my viceroy in Africa, enjoining him, that, as often as he finds any instances of this madness, he is to send the guilty, forthwith, to my court, lest any longer, beneath so great a shining of our God, such things be done by them, as may provoke the greatest anger of the Heavenly Providence.

May Almighty God keep you safe, my dearest Brothers, through the ages, in answer to my prayers and yours.

# APPENDIX—VI

## EPISTOLA CONSTANTINI IMPERATORIS AD EPISCOPOS PARTIS DONATI

A.D. 315

### Introduction

St. Augustine informs us (*Ep.* xliii, 20) that, in accordance with what we read in this letter, Constantine, after the Council of Arles, commanded representatives of both Catholics and Donatists to appear before him at Rome. The Donatists complied, but on the appointed day Caecilian failed to arrive. Constantine thereupon put off his judgement until a later date and directed that the Donatists should be conducted under a safeguard to Milan. Some of them, however, contrived to escape before Caecilian arrived at Milan—to be vindicated a third time from the charges which had been so persistently brought against his good name.

CONSTANTINE AUGUSTUS TO THE DONATIST BISHOPS:

A few days ago I determined that, in accordance with your demand, you should go back to Africa, so that there the whole case, which you think lies against Caecilian, should be tried by friends of mine whom I had chosen, and reach a fitting conclusion. However, whilst I was thinking it over for a long time, and duly turning the matter over in my mind, I deemed it best, rather than this—since I know that some of your party are full of turbulence and obstinately refuse to regard the right judgement and the statement of the complete truth, and that for this reason it would perhaps happen, that if the case were tried in Africa it would be determined, not as is fitting, and as the demands of truth require, but that through your exceedingly great obstinacy something might easily result which would both be displeasing to God in Heaven, and also would be exceedingly detrimental to my good reputation, which I desire always to preserve undiminished—that Caecilian should preferably come here, as was first settled. Thus, as I have said, I have determined, and I believe that, in compliance with my letter, he will soon arrive. But I promise you, that if, in his presence, you prove by your evidence anything against him concerning even one accusation or evil deed, I will regard this the same as though all your charges were seen to be proved.

May Almighty God grant us perpetual safety!

## APPENDIX—VII

### EXEMPLUM EPISTOLAE PRAEFECTORUM PRAETORIO AD CELSUM VICARIUM, QUA REMITTUNTUR IN AFRICAM DONATISTAE QUI IN GALLIAS VENERANT PROPTER CAUSSAM CAECILIANI.

A.D. 315

#### Introduction

Du Pin dates this letter 316; but (though Ziwsa follows him in printing it after the succeeding letter *Perseverare Menalium*) this must be a mistake. The letter itself concludes thus:

'Hilarus Princeps optulit IV Kal. Maias, Triberos'[1]

It is addressed to Celsus who had by April 316 given place to Eumelius as Vicar of Africa. It was therefore written in 315. It carries into execution Constantine's permission, of which we have just read in the preceding letter, to the Donatist Bishops to return to Africa after the Council of Arles. Of itself it has no intrinsic importance, but is of some interest in consequence of its close connection with the document given by Optatus (i, 23), containing the names of the obscure signatories of the famous appeal to Constantine. Optatus records the names of Lucianus, Dignus, Nasutius, Capito and Fidentius. These all reappear in the document before us, excepting Dignus, who perhaps had died at Arles.

[1] Duchesne writes (*op. cit.* p. 24): 'Triberos, et non Tiberis, comme dans les éditions.'

PETRONIUS ANNIANUS AND JULIANUS TO DOMITIUS CELSUS THE VICAR OF AFRICA.

Since Lucian, Capito, Fidentius, Nasutius the Bishops, and Mammarius the priest, who in accordance with the divine precept of the Lord Constantine Maximus, the unconquered, always august, had gone to Gaul with other men of their Law,[1] were commanded by his Majesty to proceed to their own homes, we have, my brother, in compliance with the command of the Eternity of our most clement Lord, ordered for them a service of post-horses, with suitable provisions,[2] so far as the port of Arles, from which they may set sail for Africa, a fact which it is desirable that your Carefulness[3] should learn from this our letter.

We pray, my Brother, that the best of good fortune may always attend you.

Given at Trèves on April 28, by Hilary, the Magistrate.

[1] *Legis eius*, i.e. Donatism, as contrasted with *Lex Catholica*.
[2] *angarialem his cum annonaria conpetentia . . . dedimus.*
[3] *Sollertiam tuam.*

# APPENDIX—VIII

## EPISTOLA CONSTANTINI IMPERATORIS AD CELSUM VICARIUM AFRICAE

### A.D. 315 OR 316

### INTRODUCTION

THIS letter was written by Constantine during the interval that elapsed between the appearance of the Donatists at Rome and the judgement at Milan. It betrays considerable irritation even against Caecilian, due no doubt to the fact that he had failed to obey the Emperor's summons (given in a letter no longer extant) to Rome. Constantine in this letter expresses a new determination—which he failed to carry out—to go himself to Africa and investigate the conditions on the spot. Since Constantine mentions in this letter the 'flight' of some of the Donatists as having already taken place, it was not written before September 315, when the Emperor left Rome; on the other hand it must have been written before Celsus was succeeded as Vicar of Africa by Eumelius early in 316. We are thus enabled to fix its date, as having been written in the autumn of 315 or the winter of 315–316.

TO CELSUS, THE VICAR OF AFRICA:

The latest despatches from your Lordship have informed me how Menalius,[1] a man whom madness long ago took hold of, and the others who have departed from the truth of God, and given themselves over to a most shameful error, persevere in their course. You tell me in your letter, my well-beloved Brother, that you have obeyed my order with regard to the seditious in accordance with their deserts, and have placed a check upon the tumult which they were preparing. And now that they were contemplating wicked deeds has become manifest from the fact that, when I had determined to inquire most fully between them and Caecilian, concerning the various charges which they brought against him, they did their best to withdraw from my presence by taking to flight.[2] By this most disgraceful deed they acknowledged that they were hastening to return to the things which they both had done previously and are now persisting in doing. But (since it is certain that no one ever gains an unmixed advantage from his own misdeeds, even though punishment may be delayed for a little while), I have thought well to command your Lordship that in the meantime you should leave them alone,[3] and understand that we must temporise with them.[4]

But after you have read this letter, you should make it plain both to Caecilian and to them, that when by the Divine Goodness I come to Africa, I shall render it most

[1] *eum Menalium.* Probably the Menalius mentioned by Optatus (i, 13) as having been present at the Council of Cirta.

[2] The MS. has *praesentia mea susceptam fugam subtrahere.* This seems impossible to translate, even though, with Ziwsa, we read *praesentiae meae.* If, with Du Pin, we read *suscepta fuga se subtrahere,* the sense becomes clear.

[3] *eosdem omittas.*

[4] *dissimulandum super ipsos cognoscas.*

clear to all, both to Caecilian, and to those who are acting against him, by reading a perfectly plain judgement, as to what and what kind [1] of worship is to be given to the Supreme God, and with what manner of service He is pleased. Also, by diligent examination, I shall acquaint myself to the full with the things which at the present time some persons fancy they can keep dark through the allurements [2] of their ignorant minds, and shall drag them into the light. Those same persons who now stir up the people in such a war as to bring it about that the supreme God is not worshipped with the veneration that is His due, I shall destroy and dash in pieces.[3] And since it is sufficiently clear that no one may hope to obtain the honours of a martyr with that kind [of Martyrdom] [4] which is seen to be foreign to the truth of religion, and is altogether unbecoming, I shall without any delay cause those men whom I shall ascertain to have acted against that which is right and against religion itself, and whom I shall discover to have been guilty of violence [5] in their worship, to undergo the destruction which they have deserved by their madness and reckless obstinacy.

Wherefore, let them also know for certain what they ought to do to secure full credence after they have invoked their own salvation,[6] since I am going most diligently to search into the things which concern not merely the

[1] *quae et qualis.*

[2] *inlecebris.* The editors read *in latebris.*

[3] *perdam atque discutiam.*

[4] *posse beatitudines martyris eo genere conquirere.* Duchesne paraphrases thus (*op. cit.* p. 37): 'Il ne reculera pas devant la rigueur, et ceux qui s'en trouveront mal ne devront pas s'attendre à ce qu'on les regarde comme des martyres.'

[5] The MS. reads *violentiae*; Ziwsa reads *violentes.*

[6] *ad plenissimam fidem salute etiam teste invocata.* The sense seems to be that the clerics were to invoke their own salvation as witness to their fullest fidelity or truthfulness. 'As they hoped for salvation,' this was to be the Christian formula, as distinguished from the old appeal to heathen deities, in confirmation of evidence.

people, but also those clerics who are in the first places, and shall pass judgement in accordance with that which is most clearly in the interests of truth and religion. I shall also make these persons see what worship and what kind of worship is to be given to the Divinity, for by no means do I believe that I can in any way escape the greatest guilt otherwise than by refusing to close my eyes to that which is wicked. What can be done by me more in accordance with my constant practice,[1] and the very office of a Prince, than, after having driven away errors and destroyed all rash opinions, to bring it about that all men should show forth true religion and simplicity in concord, and to render to Almighty God the worship which is His due ?

[1] *pro instituto meo.*

# APPENDIX—IX

## EPISTOLA CONSTANTINI IMPERATORIS AD EPISCOPOS ET PLEBEM AFRICAE, UT DONATISTAS TOLERENT

A.D. 321

### Introduction

This letter speaks for itself. It seems to be contemporaneous with the Rescript of Verinus (May 5, 321). Its object is to inform the Catholics of Africa that the Government had changed its plan of dealing with the recalcitrant Donatists. Rigorous measures were to be abandoned, and toleration granted, in the hope of attaining good results in the end. With regard to this new determination Duchesne writes as follows (*op. cit.* p. 28):

> 'This toleration, in face of the fanaticism, of the audacity and the violence of the schismatics, was in reality an abandonment. Without doubt the Emperor exhorts the Catholic Bishops to endure with patience the wrongs inflicted upon them by the Donatists; he also makes reparation, up to a certain point, for the material damage caused by these sectaries, but this does not make it less true that he tolerates them. In thus granting them toleration, he goes back upon his much more decided attitude anterior to the Rescript of 321 and allows the judgement to fall into abeyance, which he had himself given against Donatus and in favour of Caecilian.'

## Letter of Constantine on Toleration to be granted to the Donatists.

Constantine Augustus to all the Bishops in Africa and to the people of the Catholic Church. You know right well that, as Faith required, so far as Prudence permitted, as much as a single-minded intention[1] could prevail, I have endeavoured by every effort of kindly government to secure that, in accordance with the prescriptions of our law, the Peace of the most holy Brotherhood,[2] whose grace the supreme God has poured into the hearts of His servants, should, through complete concord, be preserved secure. But whereas the provisions that we have made have not prevailed to subdue the obstinate violence of crime, which has been implanted in the breasts of certain men—few though they be—and whereas some favour is still shown to this wickedness of theirs, so that they would not on any account suffer a place in which they were proud to have sinned[3] to be extorted from them, we must see to it, that as all this evil affects a few, it may be, through the mercy of Almighty God, mitigated for the people. For we ought to hope for a remedy, from that source to which all good desires and deeds are referred.[4] But, until the Heavenly medicine shows itself, our designs must be moderated so far as to act with patience, and whatever in their insolence they attempt or carry out, in accordance with their habitual wantonness—all this we must endure with the strength which comes from tranquillity. In no way let wrong be returned to wrong,

[1] *puritas.*

[2] *Pax illa sanctissimae fraternitatis.* (The Catholic Church.)

[3] i.e. the basilicas, in which they were proud (*gauderent*) to have sinned by their schism.

[4] *quo omnia bona vota et facta referuntur.* *Quo* is an emendation for *cum* of the MS.

for it is the mark of a fool to snatch at that vengeance which we ought to leave to God, especially since our faith ought to lead us to trust that whatever we may endure from the madness of men of this kind, will avail before God for the grace of martyrdom. For what is it, to overcome in this world in the Name of God, excepting to endure with an unshaken heart the untamed savagery of men who harass the people of the Law of Peace? But, if you will give yourselves loyally to this affair, you will speedily bring it about that, by the favour of God on high, these men, who are making themselves the standard-bearers of this most miserable strife, may all come to recognise, as their laws[1] or customs[2] fall into decay,[3] that they ought not, through the persuasion of a few, to give themselves over to perish in everlasting death,[4] when they might, through the grace of repentance, be made whole again, having corrected their errors, for everlasting life.

Fare you well, by your common prayer, for ever, by God's favour, dearest brethren.[5]

[1] *institutis.* [2] *moribus.* [3] *languescentibus.*
[4] *leto.* The MS. has *laeto.*
[5] *Valete voto communi per saecula, iubente Deo, fratres carissimi!*

# APPENDIX—X

## RESCRIPTUM CONSTANTINI AD EPISCOPOS NUMIDAS

UBI HAERETICI TULERUNT BASILICAS A CATHOLICIS UT AD ALIAM BASILICAM FACIENDAM SIBI LOCUM VEL DOMUM EIS DENT.

A.D. 330

### INTRODUCTION

IN this Rescript Constantine provides that, as the Donatists refused to give back to Catholics their basilicas—amongst which was one that he had himself built for their use—the Donatists should, lest worse things befall, be left in undisturbed possession of their ill-gotten goods, and that a new Church should be built, again at his expense, to provide for the religious needs of Catholics. He also states that he had ordered that certain exemptions, relative to the *curia* and *munera personalia*, of which the Donatists had succeeded by their intrigues in depriving Catholic clerics of lower degree, should be restored to them, according to a custom which was already ancient.

Duchesne has shown (*op. cit.* pp. 28, 29) that certain passages in this letter are in even verbal accord with the prescriptions of Constantine in his letter to the Consular of Numidia still preserved in a law of the Theodosian Code.

He prints them as follows in parallel columns :

| *Letter to the Numidian Bishops.* | *Theodosian Code, xvi, ii.*[1] |
| --- | --- |
| Ad consularem quoque scribi mandavi Numidiae ut ipse in eiusdem ecclesiae fabricatione in omnibus sanctimoniam vestram iuvaret. | Imp. Constantinus Valentino consulari Numidiae. |
| Lectores etiam Ecclesiae Catholicae et hypodiacones, reliquos quoque [qui] instinctu memoratorum quibusdam pro moribus ad munera vel ad decurionatum vocati sunt, iuxta sta[tu]tum legis meae[1] ad nullum munus statui evocandos. Sed et eos qui ducti sunt haereticorum instinctu iussimus protinus molestis perfunctionibus absolvi. | Lectores divinorum apicum et hypodiaconi ceterique clerici qui per iniuriam haereticorum ad curiam devocati sunt absolvantur; et de cetero ad similitudinem Orientis minime ad curias devocentur sed immunitate plenissima potiantur. |
| Data non. febr., Serdica. | Data non. febr., Serdica. |

Constantine evidently was as good as his word. He dated, and no doubt despatched, his letters on the same day to the Numidian Bishops and his Prefect in Africa. Would that Princes had always thus faithfully kept their promises to the Church.

[1] Cod. Theod. xvi, ii, 1, 2; cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* x, 7.

## Rescript of Constantine to the Bishops of Numidia.

Constantine the supreme Victor and always triumphant Emperor, to Zenuzius, Gallicus, Victorinus, Sperantius, Januarius, Felix, Crescentius, Pontius, Victor, Babbertius, Donatus, Bishops.

Since this is certainly the Will of the Supreme God, who is the Author of this world and its Father, (through whose goodness we enjoy life, look up to heaven, and rejoice in the society of our fellow-men), that the whole human race should agree together and be joined in a certain affectionate union by, as it were, a mutual embrace, it is not doubtful that heresies and schism have come from the devil, who is the head of wickedness. Therefore, there is no room to doubt that whatever heretics do, is done through his prompting who has taken possession of their senses, minds and thoughts. For, when he has reduced men of this character beneath his power, he rules them in every sort of fashion. And what good thing can be done by a man who is insane, unbelieving, irreligious, profane, opposed to God, an enemy of the Holy Church, who (departing from God, the Holy, the True, the Just, the Supreme, and the Lord of all, from Him who has given us life and preserved us in this world—having bestowed upon us breath for the life which we enjoy, and willed us to have, that which is His own [1]—and has made all things perfect by His Will) runs on the downward path to the side of the devil? But, inasmuch as the soul which has once been possessed by the Evil One—for it must needs do the works of its teacher—does those things which are opposed to equity and justice, it follows that they who have been possessed by the devil yield themselves to his falsehood and wickedness. Moreover,

[1] *qui nos id quod suum esse voluit.* These last words are clearly corrupt. I have translated, emending *esse* to *est habere.*

it is not to be wondered at [1] that the wicked depart from the good, for thus has it been rightly laid down in the proverb, 'Like flock with like together.' [2] It must needs be that those who have been stained with the evil of an impious mind should depart from our fellowship. For, as Scripture says, the wicked man brings forth wicked things from a wicked treasure,[3] but the good man brings forth good from good. But since (as we have said) heretics and schismatics, who, deserting good and following after evil, do the things that are displeasing to God, are proved to cling to the devil, who is their father, most rightly and wisely has your Gravity [4] acted in accordance with the holy precepts of the Faith, by abstaining from contending with their perversity, and giving them the use of that which they claim for themselves, though they have no right to it, and it does not belong to them, lest—so great is their wicked and shameless perversity—they might even break out into tumults, and stir up men like themselves at their crowded meetings, and thus a state of sedition might be produced, which could not be allayed. For their criminal purpose always requires them to do the works of the devil. Therefore, since the Bishops of God overcome them, together with their father himself,[5] by patience, let those who are the worshippers of the Supreme God obtain glory for themselves, but these others condemnation and condign punishments. In fact, may the Judgement of the Supreme God become the more imposing and appear [6] the more just from this, that He bears with them in calmness, and His patience condemns all the deeds which have come from them, enduring them for a while, for God indeed has declared that He is the Avenger of all. So when vengeance is reserved to God, the enemy is punished the more severely. And

[1] *mirandum est.* The MS. has *miratum est.*
[2] Cf. Cicero, *Cato m.* 3, 7. [3] Cf. Matthew vii, 17, 18.
[4] *Gravitas vestra.* [5] *cum ipso suo patre* (i.e. the devil).
[6] *ex hoc quippe maius existat.* For *existat* Du Pin reads *exstat.*

I have now been informed that you, the servants of God, have done this willingly, and I have rejoiced that you demand no punishment upon the impious and wicked, the sacrilegious and profane, the perfidious and irreligious, upon those who displease God and are the enemies of the Church, but rather ask that they should be pardoned. This is to know God truly and thoroughly, this is to walk in the way of His Commandments, this is to believe with happiness, this is to think with truth, this is to understand that when the enemies of the Church are spared in this world, the greater punishment is laid up against them for hereafter.

I have learnt by the receipt of the letter of your Wisdom and Dignity, that the heretics or schismatics, with their accustomed wickedness, determined to seize the basilicas belonging to the Catholic Church, which I had ordered to be built in the City of Constantine,[1] and that, though they had been often warned, both by us and by our judges at our command, to give up what was not theirs, they have refused to do so, but that you, imitating the Patience of the most high God, with a calm mind relinquish to their wickedness what is yours, and ask instead for another site for yourselves in exchange, namely the Custom House. This petition of yours I gladly welcomed, according to my custom, and straightway sent a suitable letter to the accountant,[2] commanding him to see that our Custom House should be passed over, with all its rights, to the ownership of the Catholic Church. I have given you this with ready liberality, and have ordered it to be at once delivered to you. I have also commanded a basilica to be built on that spot at the Imperial expense, and have directed letters to be written to the Consular of Numidia,[3]

[1] *In Constantina civitate.* Cirta had only recently received its new name.

[2] *rationalem.*

[3] *ad Consularem Numidiae. Consularis* is one who has been consul; consequently '*consularis Numidiae*' = governor of Numidia, as he was not technically 'proconsul' but prefect.

telling him to be of assistance to your Holiness in all things which concern the building of this Church. I have also decreed, in accordance with my Statute law, that the lectors and subdeacons [1] of the Catholic Church, and any others who, by the command of the above-mentioned, have been summoned in consequence of their fitness, to public offices, or to the decurionship, should be free from all public obligations [2]; also we have provided that those who at the instigation of heretics had been summoned, should forthwith be set free from disagreeable duties.[3] For the rest I have also ordered that the law which I have made concerning Catholic ecclesiastics be observed. All these things have been written out at length, as this letter testifies, in order that they may be made known to your patience. And indeed, oh that the heretics or schismatics would at length provide for their own salvation, and that, having wiped away the darkness from their eyes, they would open them to the vision of true light, and that they would depart from the devil, and, however late, would flee to God, who is One and True, and the Judge of all mankind. But, since it is clear that they are remaining in their malice, and wish to die in their crimes, our warning and former careful exhortation is enough for them. For if they had been willing to obey our commands, they would have been freed from all evil. Let us. however, my Brothers, follow after the things that are ours, let us walk in the way of the Commandments, let us by good actions keep the Divine Precepts, let us free our life from errors and with the help of the mercy of God, let us direct it along the right path.

Given on February 5 at Sardica.

DEO GRATIAS.

[1] *hypodiacones.* [2] Cf. Appendix—xvi, p. 430.
[3] *molestis perfunctionibus absolvi.*

# APPENDIX—XI

## ACTA CONCILII CIRTENSIS

### A.D. 305

### Introduction

This document seems to have been joined in the Appendix to the *Gesta apud Zenophilum.* Its substance was given by St. Optatus (i, 14) who added :

> ' Sicut scripta Nundinarii tunc diaconi testantur et vetustas membranarum testimonium perhibet, quas dubitantibus proferre poterimus ; harum namque plenitudinem rerum in novissima parte istorum libellorum ad implendam fidem adiunximus.'

It was produced by Catholics at the Conference of Carthage (*Coll.* iii, 351–355, 387–400, 408–432, 452–470 ; *Brev. Coll.* iii, xv, xvii). St. Augustine quotes it in several passages (*con. Cresc.* iii, 26, 27 ; *Ep.* xliii, 3 ; *c. Litt. Petil.* i, 21 ; *de unico Baptismo* xvii ; *ad Donat. post coll.* xiv (Cirtense concilium, si tamen concilium dicendum est, in quo vix undecim vel duodecim Episcopi fuerunt) ; *con. Gaud.* i, 47 &c.). I give a translation of the document as it is to be found almost in its entirety in *con. Cresc.* iii, 27.

## ACTS OF THE COUNCIL OF CIRTA

When Diocletian was Consul for the eighth and Maximinian for the seventh time, on March 4, after Secundus, Bishop of Tigisis and Primate, had taken his seat in the house of Urbanus Donatus,[1] he said :

'Let us first see that all are duly qualified to act, and thus we shall be able to consecrate a Bishop.'

Secundus said to Donatus of Mascula :

'It is alleged that you have been guilty of Betrayal.'

Donatus replied :

'You know how Florus searched for me to make me offer incense, and God did not deliver me into his hands, my brother ; but since God has pardoned me, so do you too leave me to God.'

Secundus said :

'What then are we to do about the Martyrs ? They have been crowned because they did not "betray."'

Donatus said :

'Send me to God. Before Him I will render my account.'

Secundus said :

'Come to one side.'

Secundus said to Marinus of the Waters of Tibilis :

'It is alleged that you too were guilty of Betrayal.'

Marinus answered :

'I did give papers to Pollus. My codices are safe.'

Secundus said :

'Stand on one side.'

Secundus said to Donatus of Calama :

'It is alleged that you were guilty of Betrayal.'

Donatus answered :

'I gave them medical treatises.'

[1] Cf. Optatus i, 14 : 'Quia basilicae necdum fuerunt restitutae, in domum Urbani Carisi consederunt.'

Secundus said :

' Stand on one side.'

*And in another place :*

Secundus said to Victor of Rustica :

' It is alleged that you " betrayed " four Gospels.'

Victor answered :

' Valentianus was *Curator*. He forced me to throw them into the fire. I knew that they were lost. Pardon me this fault and God will also pardon me.'

Secundus said :

' Stand on one side.'

*And in another place :*

Secundus said to Purpurius of Limata :

' It is alleged that you killed at Milevis the two sons of your sister.'

Purpurius answered :

' Do you think that I am frightened of you, like the rest ? What have *you* done, who were forced by the Curator and the soldiers to give up the Scriptures ? How did you come to be set free by them, unless you surrendered something, or ordered it to be surrendered ? For they did not let you go at random. Yes, I did kill, and I intend now to kill those who act against me. So do not now provoke me to say anything more. You know that I interfere with nobody's affairs.'

Secundus the Less said to Secundus his uncle :

' Do you hear what he is saying against you ? He is ready to leave, and make a schism ; and not only he, but also all those who are accused by you. I know that they intend to abandon you, and pronounce sentence against you. You will then remain alone, a heretic. So what business is it of yours what any one has done ? He has to render an account to God.'

Secundus said to Felix of Rotarium, [to Nabor] of Centurio and Victor of Garba :

' What do you think ? '

They answered:

'They have God, to whom they must render their account.'

Secundus said:

'You know and God knows. Sit down.'

And they all answered:

'Thanks be to God.'

# APPENDIX—XII

## RELATIO ANULINI PROCONSULIS AD IMPERATOREM

A.D. 313

### Introduction

We have here a report of the Pro-Consul Anulinus to Constantine, informing him that he had duly sent his letter to Caecilian, but that a few days afterwards he had been approached by a deputation, followed by a crowd of people, requesting him to transmit two documents—one sealed, the other open—to the Emperor (cf. Opt. i, 22).

This document was produced in its entirety by the Catholics at the Carthage Conference (*Gesta Coll. Carthag. diei* iii, ccxv–ccxx, cccxvi, cf. *Brev.* iii, 8, 24). It has also been reproduced by St. Augustine (*Ep.* lxxxviii, 2, from which source I have made my translation) and is often mentioned by him (*con. Crescon.* iii, 67; *De Un. Bapt.* 28; *Ep.* lxxxix, 3; cxxviii, 2; cxxiv, 9, &c.).

## Report of Anulinus to the Emperor.

My duty[1] has caused me, amongst the acts of my insignificance,[2] to send your Majesty's heavenly letter,[3] after I had received and venerated it,[4] to Caecilian and his subordinate clerics[5]; at the same time I exhorted them that—now that Unity has been effected with general consent, since through the condescension of your Majesty their liberty was seen to be in every respect completely secure, and the Catholic Church was protected—they should apply themselves to the service of their holy Law and to the things of God, with due reverence. But a few days afterwards I was approached by certain persons, followed by a great throng of the populace, who held that Caecilian must be opposed, and presented me in my official capacity[6] with two documents, one bound in leather and sealed, the other a *libellus* unsealed, and demanded with insistence that I should send them to the sacred and venerable Court of your Highness. This my littleness has been careful to do (preserving Caecilian in his position), and I have forwarded their Acts, that your Majesty may be in a position to determine everything. I have sent the two *libelli*, of which the one bound in leather has been endorsed *Libellus Ecclesiae Catholicae criminum Caeciliani traditus a parte Maiorini*.[7] Also the one without a seal together with that in leather. Given on the fifteenth of April at Carthage when Constantine Augustus was for the third time Consul.

[1] *devotio mea.* [2] *parvitatis meae.*

[3] *scripta caelestia.* This letter has been preserved by Eusebius (x, 7). I subjoin a translation (Appendix xvi).

[4] *accepta atque adorata.*

[5] *his qui sub eodem agunt, quique clerici appellantur.* This is taken from Constantine's own 'heavenly letter.'

[6] *obtulerunt dicationi meae.* Cf. *Edictum Marcellini* (Migne, *P.L.* ix. 819, 820): 'epistulis ad *meam dicationem* currentibus,' and qui *dicationi meae* de publicis praestolantur officiis.'

[7] Cf. p. 43, n. 3.

# APPENDIX—XIII

## EPISTOLA CONSTANTINI AD MELCHIADEM

A.D. 313

### Introduction

In this letter Constantine calls upon Pope Melchiades (or Miltiades) to judge the question lately raised in Africa between Caecilian and his accusers. The Emperor encloses for the Pope's information the two documents which (as we have just read) he had lately received from Anulinus (cf. Optatus, i, 22; Augustine, *Ep.* xliii, 5; *Ep.* xciii, 13; *de Unit.* xviii; *con. Crescon.* iii, 61). This letter has been preserved for us by Eusebius (*H.E.* x, 5) Ἐπειδὴ τοιοῦτοι. It was produced by the Catholics at the Conference in 411 (*Coll.* iii, 319; *Brev.* iii, 12).

## Letter of the Emperor Constantine in which he provides for the Case concerning Caecilian to be judged at Rome.

Constantine Augustus to Miltiades Bishop of Rome and to Marcus.[1] Whereas several documents[2] have been sent to me from Anulinus, the most illustrious Pro-Consul of Africa, in which it is shown that Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage, has been accused on many grounds by certain of his fellow-Bishops[3] in Africa—since it appears to me a very grievous[4] thing that in those Provinces which Divine Providence has freely committed to my fidelity, where there is a vast population, the multitude (as it were divided into twain) are found to be deteriorating, and the Bishops, amongst others, are at variance—I have resolved that this Caecilian with ten of the Bishops who accuse him and ten others whom he himself may choose to aid in his defence, shall sail to Rome; that there in your presence and in the presence of Reticius, Maternus and Marinus your fellow-Bishops, whom I have ordered to hasten to Rome for this purpose, this case may be determined in the manner which you know to be in agreement with the most holy Law.[5] Moreover, that you may derive the fullest knowledge of all this business, I have added copies of the documents which were sent me by Anulinus, to my letters to your above-mentioned fellow-Bishops. After you have perused these your Gravity[6]

[1] *καὶ Μάρκῳ.* Baronius suspected that the text was here corrupt and suggested *ἱεράρχῃ.* But Marcus was probably a priest in Rome high in the counsels of Miltiades—very likely the Marcus who succeeded Silvester as Pope (Opt. ii, 3). *Μάρκῳ* may, however, be a mistake for *Μεροκλεί*, the Bishop of Milan, who was present at the Roman Council (Opt. i, 23).

[2] *χάρται*, called *chartae* in *Coll. Carthag.* (*diei* iii, cccvi).

[3] *κολλήγων αὐτοῦ.* [4] *βαρὺ σφόδρα.*

[5] i.e. of the Catholic Church; cf. p. 333, n. 2.

[6] *ἡμετέρα στερρότης.*

will carefully consider in what way this controversy may be most accurately investigated and justly decided. And it will not have escaped your careful observation that so great is my reverence for the most holy Catholic Church that I am absolutely unwilling that any schism or dissension should be left in any place by you.[1] My most esteemed one,[2] may the Divinity of the Most High God preserve you for many years.

[1] ἔν τινι τόπῳ ὑμᾶς καταλιπεῖν.

[2] τιμιώτατε.

# APPENDIX—XIV

## CONSTANTINI EPISTOLA AD PROBIANUM, QUA INGENTIUM AD COMITATUM MITTI IUBET

A.D. 315

### Introduction

This letter was produced by the Donatists at the Conference in 411 (*Coll. Carthag. Diei* iii, dlvi, dlviii; *Brev.* iii, 41, 42). St. Augustine gives us the complete text (*con. Crescon.* iii, lxx. Cf. *Ep.* lxxxviii, 4; *ad Donat.* 19).

## Letter of the Emperor Constantine to Probianus the Pro-Consul of Africa.

The Emperors Constantine Maximus and Valerius Licinius Caesars to Probianus the Pro-Consul of Africa.

Your predecessor Aelianus at a time when he was discharging the duties of that most worthy man, Verus our Vicar, in consequence of his ill-health, thought well (and with reason), amongst other matters, to investigate and determine the business—that is, the charges—brought by envy against Caecilian, a Bishop of the Catholic Church. For after he had secured the presence of Superius the centurion, and Caecilianus the Magistrate of Aptunga, and Saturninus [1] who was formerly *Curator*, and Calidius [2] the younger Curator, and Solon a public official of that city, he gave them a fair hearing—so that when it was alleged as an objection against Caecilian that he had been raised to the Episcopate by Felix, who was accused of the Betrayal and burning of the Divine Scriptures, the innocence of Felix was proved. Finally, when Maximus charged Ingentius, a decurion of Ziqua, with having falsified a letter of Caecilianus formerly Duovir, we have learned from the Acts of the Proceedings that this Ingentius was prepared for torture, and was only saved by his statement that he was a decurion of Ziqua.[3] Wherefore it is our will that you should despatch this Ingentius, under suitable escort, to my Court of Constantine Augustus,[4] so that it may be made quite clear, in the presence and hearing of those who are concerned with this affair, and for some time past have been incessantly appealing to me, that it is to no purpose that they show their malice against Caecilian

[1] The Claudius (or Calidius) Saturianus of Optatus (i, 27).
[2] The Calidius Gratianus of Optatus (*id.*).
[3] Cf. p. 343.
[4] *ad comitatum meum Constantini Augusti.*

the Bishop and have been pleased to bestir themselves against him with violence. So will it be brought to pass that these disputes having ceased, as is right, the people may without any dissension serve their religion [1] with the reverence that is its due.

[1] *religioni propriae cum debita veneratione deserviat.*

## APPENDIX—XV

A.D. 312

We have here a letter of the Emperor Constantine to the Pro-Consul Anulinus, commanding that restitution should be made of their property to the Catholic churches. It has been preserved by Eusebius (*H.E.* x, 5).

## An Imperial Decree

Hail, Anulinus, most highly esteemed by us! After this manner is our benevolence, that we will that those things which by just title belong to others should not only remain unmolested, but also, when necessary, be restored, most esteemed Anulinus! Wherefore we decree that, so soon as you have received this letter, if any of those things which belong to the Catholic Church of the Christians, in the several cities or other places, are held by Decurions or by any others, these you shall cause immediately to be restored to their churches. For we have determined that whatever these same churches formerly possessed shall be restored in accordance with justice. When therefore your Fidelity [1] has understood that this decree of our orders is most clear, you will make haste to see that everything, whether gardens or houses, or whatever else belongs to these churches, be restored to them as soon as may be possible—that we may learn that you have attended to, and most carefully carried into execution, this our decree. Farewell, my most esteemed and beloved Anulinus.

[1] ἡ καθοσίωσις ἡ σή.

## APPENDIX—XVI

A.D. 312 OR 313

LETTER OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE TO THE PRO-CONSUL ANULINUS, CONCERNING THE IMMUNITY OF CLERICS BELONGING TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AT CARTHAGE, WHERE CAECILIAN WAS BISHOP.

This letter has been preserved by Eusebius (*H.E.* x, 7).

A Copy of a Letter of the Emperor Constantine, in which he orders that all those holding Office in the Churches should be exempt from all Civil Duties.

Hail, Anulinus, most highly esteemed by us! Whereas from many incidents it is abundantly clear that whenever the religion, by which the supreme reverence due to the Divine Majesty is guarded, has been held in contempt, the greatest perils have overtaken the State, and whereas this religion, when it has been duly accepted and protected, has, through the goodness of God, conferred the highest prosperity on the Roman name and has given their chief benefits to all human affairs—We have resolved that those men, who with due piety and careful observance of this Law, have given their service to the divine worship, should receive the recompence for their labours, O most esteemed Anulinus!

Wherefore it is our will that those men called Clerics, who within the Province entrusted to your care serve this most holy religion in the Catholic Church, over which Caecilian presides, shall be held totally exempt from all public offices, to the end that they may not, through some mistake or sacrilegious deviation, be drawn away from the service which is due to God Most High; but may be free to serve their own Law without any disturbance. For through their showing supreme reverence to God, the very greatest advantage will accrue to the Commonwealth. Farewell, my most esteemed and beloved Anulinus!

# INDEX

## A


AARON, 256
Acts of the Angels, the, 88
Aelianus, the proconsul, 53, 328, 331–345
Aelius Paulinus, 54 *n.* 1, 384 *n.* 1
Africa, divisions of, 28 *n.* 2, 33 *n.* 1 (cf. 379 *n.* 1)
Altar, 84, 158, 172, 246-252, 255
,, linen covering of, 251
,, sacrifice of, 37, 71, 90, 91, 149, 173-174, 176
,, set in festal array, 173
,, the seat of the Body of Christ, 247
,, wooden, in the fourth century, 36 *n.* 4, 247
Amalarius of Metz, 109 *n.* 3
Ambrose, St., and *Catholica*, 79 *n.* 2
*Angelus*, 64 *n.* 3, 65, 78–81
Antichrists, 30, 31
Antiochus, 309
Antipopes, Donatist, 69–72
Anulinus, 157
*Anulus*, 19, 25
Arius, 191
Asmodeus, 123
Augustine, St., and—
the Apostolic See, 34 *n.* 3, 47 *n.* 2, 67 *n.* 2
Baptism, 13 *n.* 1, 19 *n.* 5, 88 *n.* 4
the Catholic Church, 50 *n.* 5, 52 *n.* 1, 59 *n.* 3, 212 *n.* 2, 280 *n.* 3
the Chair of Peter, 21 *n.* 1
Christ's *Itoria*, 3 *n.* 2
Augustine, St., and—
the Circumcellions, 143 *n.* 5, 146 *n.* 3
St. Cyprian, 21 *n.* 1
*Cypriani Mensa*, 145 *n.* 3
*Diapsalma*, 183 *n.* 4
Donatus of Black Huts, 43 *n.* 3, 45 *n.* 3
the Donatists, 1 *n.* 1, 2 *n.* 2, 6 *n.* 2, 8 *n.* 4
the Evil of schism, 39 *n.* 4, 40 *n.* 4
the Pelagians, 90 *n.* 3, 103 *n.* 2
Peter, St., 86 *n.* 6
Preaching, 176 *n.* 2 (cf. 187 *n.* 5)
salt, 296 *n.* 3
Seth, 277 *n.* 4


## B


BAPTISM, 10–13, 12 *n.* 2, 13 *n.* 1, 16, 21, 88, 89, 123, 199–202, 206, 208–211, 213–245
,, the Form of, 224
,, of John, 223–227
Baptisms, False, 24
Baruch, 302
Bernard, St., and the name Israel, 118 *n.* 2
Bethsaida, Pool of, 123
Bordeaux, Pilgrim of, 126 *n.* 3
Bossuet, 284 *n.* 3
Botrus, 32
Branch theory, 85, 161
Bryce, Lord, 132 *n.* 5
Burchard of Worms, 109 *n.* 3

C

CAECILIAN, the Catholic Bishop of Carthage, 20, 29, 31–35, 37, 45, 49, 50, 53, etc.
Caecilianus, the magistrate, 54, 331–345
Cain, 178
'Captains of the Saints,' the, 144
Carisius Urbanus, 28
Carthage, Conference of, 8 *n.* 4, 386 *n.* 5
,, See of, 33 *n.* 1
Casaubon, 19 *n.* 5, 28 *n.* 7
Cataphrygae, 16
*Cathedra Cypriani*, 20 *n.* 4, 21
,, *Maiorini*, 30, 69
,, *Pestilentiae*, 72–75
,, *Petri*, 20, 21 *n.* 1, 64–74, 78, 86, 294
Catholic Church prior to all schisms, 294
,, ,, the meaning of, 50 *n.* 5
,, Name, 59
Catholicism, 23
,, an argument on behalf of, 294 *n.* 3
Celestius, 32
Celsus, 401–406
Cerdon, 22 *n.* 3
Chalice, the Sacred, 31, 252
Chapman, Dom John, O.S.B., xxxi, 3 *n.* 2, 43 *n.* 3, 45 *n.* 3, 362 *n.* 2
Chiliasm, 244 *n.* 2, 290
Chrism, the holy, 100, 149, 289–293
Chrysostom, St. John, and Free Will, 103 *n.* 2
Church, the, Catholic, 9, 25, 50–52, 59–64, 86, 87, 91, 139, 203, 283
,, our Mother, 23, 89, 164, 187
,, the paradise of God, 89
,, the only Bride of Christ, 91
,, the Holy, 23, 24, 57
,, the One, 2 *n.* 3, 10, 14, 18, 30, 57, 90–92, 165, 203
Circumcellions, the, 143–147, 163 *n.* 1
Circumcision, 10–12, 204–206, 210
Clement of Alexandria, St., and the Catholic Church, 50 *n.* 5
*Collegium Episcopale*, 8 *n.* 1
Commandments and Counsels, 257, 258
Conference of Carthage, 45 *n.* 3
Confirmation, 163 *n.* 1, 197 *n.* 3, 293
Constans, 94 *n.* 4, 131
Constantine the Great, 30, 42, 43, 44, 49, 53, 95, 138
,, Chlorus, 43 *n.* 2
Council of Arles, 44 *n.* 1, 388–393, 399
,, Nicaea, 191
,, Rome under Pope Miltiades, 45, 47 *n.* 2, 48, 49
,, (Donatist) of Carthage, 38
,, ,, of Cirta, 27, 416
,, ,, of Theneste, 97, 266
Creed, Athanasian, the, 4 *n.* 3
Cyprian, St., 37
,, ,, and Baptism outside the Church, 221 *n.* 3
,, ,, and the *Cathedra Petri*, 66 *n.* 1, 68 *n.* 1
,, ,, and the Novatians, 90 *n.* 3
,, ,, and St. Peter, 67 *n.* 1
,, ,, and the Seven Churches, 79 *n.* 2

D

DAMASUS, St., Pope, 69 *n.* 1
Daniel, 140–142, 157
David, King, 113
Decius, 157
Degradation, rite of, 109 *n.* 3

Delphinus, 350 *n.* 5
Denny, Rev. Edward, 73 *n.* 3, 284 *n.* 3
*Dignatio*, 187 *n.* 6
Diocletian, 157
Docetae, 22 *n.* 5
Donatists, their argument, 88 *n.* 1
,, the brethren of Catholics, 1, 2 *n.* 2, 6–8, 181
,, their inconsistency, 250–252, 262–265
,, their pride, 103–105
,, their sinfulness, 183–195
,, their savagery, 96–99, 101, 102, 107
,, their schism, origin of, 34
Donatus of Bagaia, 121, 143, 146
,, of Black Huts, 43 *n.* 3, 45 *n.* 3
,, of Calama, 27
,, of Mascula, 27, 38
,, the Great, 43 *n.* 3, 45, 49, 53, 121, 131–142
Duchesne, Mgr., 43 *n.* 3, 54 *n.* 1, 109 *n.* 3, 384 *n.* 1, 388, 392 *n.* 4, 393, 401 *n.* 1, 407, 410
Du Pin, 43 *n.* 3, 284 *n.* 3

E

Ebion, 190
Elijah, 154–156, 177, 249
Elisha, 241
Endowments of the Church, 18, 20, 64 *n.* 3, 77, 78, 84 *n.* 5, 85, 87 *n.* 1, 88, 89, 91, 216
Esdras, 309
Eucharist, Holy, profanation of, 99, 108
Eunomius and Olimpius, 50
Exorcism, Baptismal, 90 *n.* 3, 193
Exorcisms of the Donatists, 5 *n.* 5, 106, 108, 193, 215

F

Faith, the one, 1 *n.* 1, 198, 208, 215, 216, 218
,, the virtue of, 89, 237–240
,, the profession of, 89
Felix of Autumna, 33, 35, 54–56, 328–345
Felix of Idicra, 101
Felix the deacon, 31
Flesh, the, of Christ, 10, 14–16, 22, 199
Flood, the, 10–12, 204–206, 210
Florus, 157, 158
*Fons signatus*, 19, 25, 64 *n.* 3, 84
Fortunatus, 350 *n.* 5.

G

Gildas, 109 *n.* 3
Gregory, the Prefect, 132

H

Harnack, Professor, vi, viii, xxv *n.* 1, 23 *n.* 3, 69 *n.* 7, 220 *n.* 1
Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, 118 *n.* 2
Hatch, Professor, 109 *n.* 3
Heresy, the nature of, 1 *n.* 1
Heretics, 7, 16, 17, 19–25, 31, 58, 198
,, Churches of, 18
Hilary, St., and salt, 296 *n.* 3
Honorius, the Emperor, 8 *n.* 4
*Hortus conclusus*, 19, 20, 24, 25 (cf. 89)

I

Ignatius the Martyr, St., and the Catholic Church, 50 *n.* 5
Innocent the First, Pope, 262 *n.* 2
Innocent the Third, Pope, and unction in Ordination, 109 *n.* 3
'Invincible Ignorance,' 66
Irenaeus, St., and list of Popes, 68 *n.* 2

J

JAMNES and Mambres, 271, 294–297
Jerome, St., on *Diapsalma*, 183 *n.* 4
,, ,, on the distinction between schism and heresy, 1 *n.* 1
,, ,, on Elam and the Elamites, 130 *n.* 1
,, ,, on the Montenses, 72 *n.* 5
,, ,, on the Name Israel, 118 *n.* 2
,, ,, on preaching, 176 *n.* 2
,, ,, on Victorinus, 16 *n.* 1
John the Baptist, 223, 225–228
Julian the Apostate, 95, 96, 265 *n.* 3

K

KORAH, Dathan, and Abiram, 39, 251

L

LAW, the Catholic, 333, 395
Leo the Great, St., and Baptism, 88 *n.* 6
*Libellus*, 358 *n.* 3
*Litterae Formatae*, 69 *n.* 3
Lot's wife, 170
Lucilla, 31, 33, 34 *n.* 1, 37, 348, 377

M

MACARIUS and persecution, 98, 121, 131, 143, 153–157, 158, 167, 173, 175–179
Majorinus, Donatist Bishop of Carthage, 20, 21, 29, 30, 37, 43 *n.* 3, 296
Marcion, 16, 22 *n.* 3, 190, 216
Marinus, Bishop of Arles, 45
Marriage Feast, the, 242
Martyrs, false, 31 *n.* 2
Maternus, Bishop of Cologne, 45
Maxentius, 32
Maximian, 157
*Memoriae Sanctorum*, 70 *n.* 3
Menalius, 27
Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage, 32, 33
Merinus of Tibilis, 27
Merocles, Bishop of Milan, 45, 423 *n.* 1
Milevis (Mileum), 27
Miltiades (or Melchiades), Pope, 45, 47, 68
Montanists, 72
Morin, Dom Germain, O.S.B., 3 *n.* 2
Moses, 154–156, 299

N

NAAMAN, 240–242
Nabor of Centurio, 29
Nicholas I, Pope, and unction in Ordination, 109 *n.* 3
Novatians, the, 90 *n.* 3
Nundinarius, 28, 347–381

O

*Oleum Peccatoris*, 11 *n.* 3, 14
*Operarii Unitatis*, 13 *n.* 2, 150, 163, 219 *n.* 5

P

PARABLE of the Sower, 280–283
Paradise, the, of God, 25
Parmenian, 8, 10, 13, 21, 24, 26, 29, 83, etc.
Patripassians, the, 207
Paul, St., the Apostle, 160, 257
Peace (*id est* Catholic Unity), Christ's parting gift to Christians, 3 (cf. 37 *n.* 1), 74–77, 95, 149, 152, 160, 174, 182, 185, 296, 297
Pelagians, the, 90 *n.* 3

Penances imposed by Donatists upon Catholics, 5, 111, 112, 118, 119, 257
Persecution under Diocletian, 26
*Persona Ecclesiae*, 86 *n.* 6
Peter, St., 213, 286–289
,, alone received the Keys, 19, 284 *n.* 3
,, and the Keys, 24
,, first Bishop of Rome, 66–68
,, head of the Apostles, 66
,, received the Keys after his sin, 283–289
Petilianus, 350 *n.* 5
Phineas, 151, 153–155, 177
Photinus, 191
Polycarp, St., and the Catholic Church, 50 *n.* 5
Popes, list of, 68–69
Praxeas, 16, 22 *n.* 4, 207
Probianus, 54 *n.* 1
*Proditores*, 356 *n.* 1
Purpurius of Limata, 27, 28, 36, 347, 359, 379
Pusey, Dr., 284 *n.* 3

Q

QUINIONS, 357 *n.* 1

R

REAL Presence, the, 100, 246, 248, 252
Re-Baptism, 5
Reticius, Bishop of Autun, 45
Rigorism in the African Church, 293 *n.* 2
Rome, list of Bishops of, 68
,, had more than forty Basilicas in fourth century, 72
,, St. Peter, first Bishop of, 66
Root of the Mother Church, 23

S

SABELLIUS, 16
*Sacerdotium*, 26 *n.* 4, 86
Sacraments, the minister of the, 209 *n.* 3, 216, 217, 219, 222 *n.* 5, 227, 230–237
,, the, 88, 90, 208, 216, 275
,, and heretics, 17 *n.* 1, 18 *n.* 4
,, Catholic, 10, 22 *n.* 6
,, lawful, 18
,, true, 25
Sacrifice of a sinner, 11, 14
,, of the Altar, 71, 90, 91, 149
Sacrilege against the Sacrament of the Altar, 99, 108, 252
,, against the Chair of Peter, 73
,, against the Holy Chrism, 100 (cf. 109 *n.* 3)
Satan, a thief, 7
Saul, King, 113
Schism, the Donatist, 25, 27, 29, 30, 34 *n.* 1, 39
,, ,, evil of, 4 *n.* 4, 25 *n.* 6, 39–42, 40 *n.* 4, 155
,, ,, nature of, 1 *n.* 1, 37
Schismatics, 11, 14, 17, 20–22, 25
Scriptures, the Holy, 208, 261, 305, 307
,, Witness of, 212
Secundus of Tigisis, 28, 29, 34, 347
,, the younger, 29
Semi-Pelagians, the, 103 *n.* 2
Seth, 277 *n.* 4
Seven Brothers, the, 309
,, Churches, the, 79 *n.* 2, 80, 93, 254
Shrines of the Apostles, the, 70, 71, 93, 152
*Sigillum*, 64 *n.* 3, 84
Silvanus, 346–381
Siricius, Pope, 69 *n.* 1
Sparrow-Simpson, Rev. W., B.D., 17 *n.* 1, 22 *n.* 2, 45 *n.* 3, 67 *n.* 2, 100 *n.* 2, 3; 217 *n.* 7

Speretius the Duovir, 328
*Spiritus*, 64 *n.* 3, 81–83
Stone, Dr. Darwell, 51 *n.* (*c*), 69 *n.* 5
Swift, Dean, 211 *n.* 5

T

TERTULLIAN, called a Champion of the Catholic Church, 16 *n.* 3
,, and Baptism, 88 *n.* 4, 209 *n.* 7
and the Keys, 24 *n.* 4
,, and the Ring, 19 *n.* 5
Testament, Christ's, 211–212
Tixeront, 103 *n.* 2, 197 *n.* 3
Tobias, the patriarch, 123
*Tractoria*, 386 *n.* 5
*Traditio*, 11 *n.* 2, 25
*Traditores*, 11–14, 21, 25, 29, 37, 92, 158
Trinity, the Holy, 209, 210, 217, 218, 224, 233
*Turificati*, 158 *n.* 4

U

*Umbilicus*, 4 *n.* 3, 84, 219 *n.* 3
Unction, 11 *n.* 3, 183
,, at Baptism, 197
,, at Ordination of priests in the fourth century, 109 *n.* 3 (cf. 113)
Unity, the Catholic, 161 (cf. 283, 289), 336

V

VALENTINUS, 16, 22 *n.* 5, 190, 199
Valerian, 157
Veils of destruction, 5
,, of nuns, 257 *n.* 3, 259, 261
Verinus, 407
Victor of Garba, 29
,, of Rusicca, 27
Victorinus of Pettau, 16
Vine, the, 20
Virginity, voluntary, 257–261

W

WATER, holy, 262 *n.* 7
Wiseman, Cardinal, xii

Z

ZENOPHILUS, 346–381
Zephyrinus, Pope, 16

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., COLCHESTER
LONDON AND ETON

IN NOTITIAM ECCLESIASTICAM AFRICÆ TABULA GEOGRAPHICA
Auctore G. DE L'ISLE Geographo
PARISIIS
Apud Auctorem Via vulgò dicta des Canettes prope Sancti Sulpitii fanum
Cum Privilegio Regis ad ricennium 1702.
In hac Tabula Metropoles Civiles Majoribus, seu initialibus litteris designandas curavimus. Oppida quæ asterisco notantur, ea sunt in quibus celebrata fuere Concilia, et eorum quidem omnium nomina hic habes præter Novæ Cæsareæ, Macrianæ & Junci quarum urbium Situm pro comperto habere non licuit. Cæterum multarum hic urbium positiones certas arbitror, sed earum ferè quæ mari alluuntur, aut quæ lineolis inter se connectuntur, quippe quæ ex frequentiori apud auctores mentione, aut ex itinerariis notiores sunt. Reliquæ neque ex tam certis regulis, neque tamen casu aut absque ulla prorsus ratione locatæ sunt.
SCALA
Milliaria
Stadia
SEPTENTRIO
MERIDIES
OCCIDENS
ORIENS
OCEANUS ATLANTICUS
MARE MEDITERRANEUM
MARE TYRRHENUM
MARE ADRIATICUM
GALLIA
GRÆCIA
ITALIA
HISPANIA
GALLÆCIA
TARRACONENSIS
LUSITANIA
CARTHAGINENSIS
BÆTICA
MAURITANIA TINGITANA
MAURITANIA CÆSARIENSIS
NUMIDIA
BYZACENA
TRIPOLITANA
LIBYÆ INTERIORIS PARS
SICILIA
SARDINIA
CORSICA
BALEARIDES INSULÆ
PITYUSÆ INSULÆ
SYRTIS MINOR
SYRTIS MAJOR
CYRENAICA
ARZUGITANA
Fretum Herculeum
Fretum Siculum
Sinus Virgitanus
Sinus Illicitanus
Atlas Major Mons
Tarraco
Barcino
Dertosa
Indibilis
Toletum
Valentia
Setabis
Ebusus I.
Ophiusa I.
Minorica I.
Majorica I.
Ulyssipo
Augusta Emerita
Ebora
Corduba
Hispalis
Illiberis
Carthago Nova
Malaca
Gades
Sacrum Prom.
Charidemum Prom.
Arelate
Roma
Capua
Neapolis
Salernum
Brundusium
Tarentum
Messana
Panormus
Syracusæ
Caralis
Utica
Carthago
Cirta
Tingis
Volubilis
Tocolosida
Sala
Banasa
Rusadirum
Macanitæ
Siga
Tubusuptus
Tubuna
Tubulbaca
Cirta
Hippo Zarytus
Hippo Regius
Thapsus
Leptis magna
Sabrata
Oea
Tacape
Lotophagites I.
Meninx
Cercina
Cercinna
Lampedusa I.
Melite I.
Gaulos I.
Sicilia
Sardinia
Corsica
Majorica
Minorica
Ebusus
Ophiusa
Balearides
Pithecusæ
Ponza I.
Ischia
Capri
Lipari
Stromboli
Ericusa I.
Maritima I.
Calathe I.
Ilva I.
Clusium
Ostia
Sipontum
Brundusium
Tarentum
Cosentia
Buxentum
Salernum
Capua
Neapolis
Roma
Portus Augusti

# The Mustard Tree

## An Argument on behalf of the Divinity of Christ

By Rev. O. R. VASSALL-PHILLIPS, C.SS.R.

With a Preface by the late Mgr. R. HUGH BENSON and an Epilogue by HILAIRE BELLOC

*Crown 8vo, 560 pages. 5s. net (postage 4d.)*

*The Times.*—'This book is attractively written, and the author sets out his points skilfully.'

*The Academy.*—'Mr. Vassall-Phillips' book is very well-written, and presents throughout a valuable exposition of faith, which should be a help to many minds.'

*The Athenæum.*—'This book addresses itself to those whose difficulties in regard to the Catholic Faith arise rather from a vague distrust, than from objections in exact thought; and it proceeds on the principle of fact first, and explanations afterwards. . . . As an illustration of the Catholic Faith—according to the modern method of Apologetic, and supported by ample quotation from the past—it is admirable.'

*The Westminster Gazette.*—'In THE MUSTARD TREE Father Vassall-Phillips unfolds an argument on behalf of the Divinity of Christ which is likely to make a powerful appeal to members of the Roman Catholic Church. . . . The argument is developed with much cogency and impressiveness.'

*The Scotsman.*—'Granting the data, the conclusion is irresistible. . . . This eloquent and well-informed book.'

*Manchester City News.*—'Father Vassall-Phillips proves himself a scholar of great attainments and far-reaching knowledge. Into his various chapters we cannot go. From his own point of view the evidence is powerful, indeed, overwhelming. But it is no part of our task to touch on theological controversy. We can only say of the volume that it is a massive piece of argument.'

*The Dublin Review.*—'The result is an extremely forcible and valuable argument for the Divinity of Christ put in a novel and striking manner.'

*The Month.*—'This book will take its place at once in the front rank of our apologetic literature, as presenting the evidences of Christianity in a fresh and persuasive fashion, well calculated to arrest the attention, and compel the consideration of the modern non-Catholic mind, distrustful as it is of *a priori* argument. . . . We congratulate the author on a notable achievement.'


*PRESS NOTICES CONTINUED ON PAGE 2*

R. & T. WASHBOURNE, LTD., 10 PATERNOSTER ROW LONDON, E.C.

*The Tablet.*—' . . . In all this Father Vassall-Phillips comes into line with the modern method of imparting instruction, starting from the nearest and best known, *per exempla*, and proceeding to the ultimate inference. Hence his argument has the advantage of being in harmony with the temper of mind induced by the tendencies of modern education . . . To read THE MUSTARD TREE is to become better equipped for any emergency which may call upon us for our defence of our Faith. . . . THE MUSTARD TREE is an eloquent and able contribution to Catholic apologetic literature, and the closing pages form a worthy conclusion to a thought-compelling argument, powerfully stated.'

*The Irish Theological Quarterly.*—'This book is recommended for the public by a preface from the pen of Mgr. Benson, and an epilogue from that of Hilaire Belloc. But it will be found to recommend itself sufficiently on its own merits as an excellent, opportune, and persuasive contribution to Catholic Apologetics.'

*The Irish Monthly.*—'This is one of the most interesting and valuable additions that have been made for a considerable time to religious literature in the English language. We trust the reading public will single it out from the ordinary run of publications. It contains solid arguments worked out with much learning and originality.'

*The Irish Catholic.*—'To theological students it will be a real boon; size and price considered, it is the best aid in the vernacular to their study of dogmas.'

*Ushaw Magazine.*—'Any of our readers who have discovered in their labours the need of a book setting out in plain language the positive evidences for the truth of Christianity, and above all for the Divinity of Christ, will find in this volume of Father Vassall-Phillips a well reasoned and concise statement of the whole question, which they can place with confidence in the hands of any ordinarily educated person, or use with profit for their own improvement. . . . This book is one of the most potent weapons in the armoury of the divinity student and of the working priest.'

*The Missionary Gazette.*—'It is all done with such a wealth of detail, such a kindly note of human sympathy, such a keen appreciation of non-Catholic mentality, that it is calculated not only to convince the mind, but also to win the heart and will. Every page bears witness to mature experience and long wrestling with the powers of unbelief and misbelief. This volume will come like a tonic to men of wavering faith, like a fresh breeze from the mountains to an atmosphere ladened with doubts and difficulties.'

*The Ecclesiastical Review.*—'Missionary priests who have to deal with non-Catholics, with prospective converts and enquirers, will find in this book a mine of useful information and telling argument. They will find, too, a presentment of the Catholic case peculiarly adapted to the usual state of mind of such people. . . . Father Vassall-Phillips treatment of the thesis of Harnack as to the origins of Catholicism, and his remarks on the question of the Fourth Gospel, will be especially useful to those who fancy that 'modern' scientific history has disposed of the Church's traditional teaching on these matters.'

*The Catholic Times.*—'The argument is drawn out with clearness and convincing force, and should appeal strongly to all men of goodwill.'

*The Oscotian.*—'The arguments, built up on the Scriptures and the Fathers are clear and thorough and masterly.'

---

R. & T. WASHBOURNE, LTD., 10 PATERNOSTER ROW LONDON, E.C.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

# Catholic Christianity

OR

## The Reasonableness of Our Religion.

Part I.—'Is the Christian Religion True?'

Part II.—'Is Catholicism True?'

Part III.—'What Does Catholic Christianity Give?'

Complete in 1 Vol., over 500 pp. - - Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

To meet the convenience of some, Part I is issued separately in paper cover at 1s. net.

*The Tablet.*—'Assuming a sort of methodic doubt, he starts by giving a rational basis to our assent to propositions so fundamental as those stating our own existence, and the reality of the extra-Ego. Then he passes to the discussion of some familiar theistic arguments. This pure philosophy is put in a form which may appeal even to minds not versed in such speculations . . . A noticeable quality of the whole book is that it is written with that sympathy combined with conviction which is so important, psychologically, in eliciting our assent to conclusions in controverted matter.'

*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record.*—'We have read the book throughout with the greatest possible interest, and have great pleasure in recommending it to every intelligent person who takes an interest in religion, be he lay or cleric, infidel, agnostic, Protestant or Catholic.'

*The Athenæum.*—'This book is devoted to a summary and critical examination of the evidences for the truth of Christianity.'

*The Universe.*—'It is alive and alert all through; there is no dullness, still less is there any darkness. The author has gone forward with a broad mind boldly to face every doubt, difficulty or dilemma that can, and does, arise, like shadows in the minds of those who are seeking for Truth.'

R. & T. WASHBOURNE, Ltd., 10 PATERNOSTER ROW LONDON, E.C.

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION
3 0311 00107 0833

1866
2000

WITHDRAWN

BT 1370 .O6713 1917

Optatus, 4th cent.

The work of St. Optatus,
Bishop of Milevis, against

BT 1370 .O6713 1917

Optatus, 4th cent.

The work of St. Optatus,
Bishop of Milevis, against

[redacted]
3 0041 00107 0833